

THE REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW

No. 2.—APRIL—1908.

I.

LOST BOOKS AND RECORDS QUOTED IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

BY PROF. A. S. ZERBE, PH.D., D.D.

The Old Testament quotes from, or refers to, various books and authorities no longer extant. The later historical books especially, and to some extent also the earlier, mention specifically, certain books, registers and chronicles to which the writer had access and which contained additional information. Our purpose is to examine these briefly, with the view of ascertaining the extent to which the sacred writers had trustworthy data. We leave out of account all supposed documents, and confine ourselves to the writings cited in express terms.¹

I. THE BOOK OF THE WARS OF JEHOVAH, NUMBERS, 21: 14.

1. The twenty-first chapter of Numbers contains three poetical quotations, the first of which is affirmed explicitly to have been taken from the "Book of the Wars of Jehovah," v. 14. The occasion of the quotation is a description of the

¹ Our inquiry has a bearing indirectly on the great critical question, whether the author, or authors of the Pentateuch had access to, and made use of documentary sources.

route of Israel beyond Moabite territory and to the border of the Amorites. Since the Arnon was in dispute, it is possible that the poem celebrated a war for its possession; the writer adduces a few lines as proof that the Arnon as the border of Moab has been taken by Israel. The fragment begins and ends in the middle of a sentence. If we supply a suitable verb, it runs thus: "Wherefore it is said in the Book of the Wars of Jehovah,

We passed Vaheb in Suphah,
And the valleys of the Arnon,
And the slope of the valleys
That inclineth toward the dwelling of Ar,
And leaneth upon the border of Moab," vs. 14, 15.

We have here the clear statement of a quotation from a "book" (Hebrew *sepher*), and unless the word has a meaning different from the uniform usage of the Old Testament, it denotes a composition in written, and not merely in oral form. The date of this book will be considered later.²

2. The second poetical quotation, Num. 21: 17, 18, is the so-called "Song of the Well":

² The word *sepher*, as also *sôpher*, scribe, are probably denominatives from *saphar*, to count, to relate, to write. Some would derive *sepher* from the Aramaic *saphar*, to cut, or shave off, whence dressed skins for writing. This etymology is not generally accepted. Since the discovery of the Tell-el-Amarna Letters, a derivation from the Assyrian has been suggested. There the verb *shaparu*, to send a letter, and the noun *shîpru*, a writing, a letter, and *shîpirtu*, a message, are of frequent occurrence. (Vid. Winckler's Tell-el-Amarna Letters.) In these, the large number of Phœnician, *silicit*, Hebrew glosses, is noteworthy and would indicate a constant interchange of words between the Assyrian and the Phœnician in 1400 B. C., and perhaps earlier. Possibly, *sepher* is an old Assyrian loan-word, finding its way into the Hebrew at an early date. So Gesenius-Buhl and Brown-Driver-Briggs lexicons, *sub voce*. It ought to be noticed, further, that the word has no connection with the usual Hebrew word meaning to write, *Kathabbâ*. If the word *sepher* was adopted from the Assyrian, or possibly already from the Babylonian, did not the thing signified go with it? Much can be said in support of the position of Koenig, as deduced from the Hammurabi Code, and the Amarna Letters, that writing was known among the Hebrews at the date of the Exodus, and possibly even in the Abrahamic period.

"Spring up, O Well; sing ye unto it;
The well, which the princes digged,
Which the nobles of the people delved,
With the sceptre and with their staves."

Moses at the command of Jehovah collects the people and gives direction for the digging of the well. "The seeking of the precious water by rude art in a thirsty valley kindles the mind of some poet of the people. And his song is spirited, with ample recognition of the zeal of the princes, who themselves take part in the labor. While they dig he chants, and the people join in the song till the words are fixed in their memory, so as to become part of the traditions of Israel" (R. A. Watson in *Expositor's Bible*).

3. The third poetical citation, Num. 21: 27-30, begins: "Wherefore they that speak in proverbs say:

Come ye to Heshbon;
Let the city of Sihon be built and established:
For a fire is gone out of Heshbon,
A flame from the city of Sihon:
It hath devoured Ar of Moab,
The lords of the high places of the Arnon, etc."

Since the introductory words, *'al-ken yomeru*, are the same as in v. 14 (except that the verb is naturally in the plural), it may be inferred that the quotation was made by the same writer from the same source. The words, "they that speak in proverbs" (in the Hebrew, one word, a participial noun) may refer to the above "Book of the Wars of Jehovah," to a different book, or even to a song handed down orally.³ Driver

³ The persons who recited the poem are called *meshalim* (v. 27), from a verb meaning to utter a *meshal*. A *meshal* may be either a parable, as in the American Revision of Ps. 49: 4 (Hebrew v. 5) and 78: 2; a satiric hymn, Micah 2: 4; Hab. 2: 6; a maxim, Prov. 1: 1, 6; or even a prophecy in verse, as the parables of Balaam, Num. 23: 7, 18; 24: 3. The second of these meanings seems to suit best here. The *meshalim* are Israelites. The words, "let the city of Sihon be built and established," imply that it was destroyed. Satirically the Israelites call on the vanquished Amorites to rebuild the city if they are able. The justification of the triumphal song is found in v. 28: "a fire is gone out of Heshbon,"

and critics generally regard the three fragments as parts of one poem. Kautzsch thinks it probable that the "Song of the Well" and other poems, as Ex. 15: 1-18, 21, were taken from this "Book": "All these fragments point to a collection of songs for the glorification of the brave deeds of the people, and especially of Jehovah as the leader and the God of Battles" (Abriss, etc.).

That which concerns us especially in this connection is the early date of this "Book" and the still earlier date of the poems preserved in it. Some, as Gray, hold that the book was a collection of ancient popular songs that had been handed down orally till the fuller establishment of a national life brought with it a period of literary activity (Commentary, p. 285). Fuerst and the older critics place it in the Mosaic period; Dillmann in that of David and Solomon; Stade in the time of Omri; Kuenen under Jehoshaphat; E. Meyer 850; Driver prior to 900. Holzinger, reviewing the recent literature, concludes: "Ueber Vermutungen kommt man da nicht hinaus" (Einleitung, Hexateuch, p. 230). Dillmann argues: "Since the book is cited for the Moses-Joshua period, and since it cannot be supposed that the later writers (J and E) would quote for their readers very late songs as witnesses of that remote period, the Wars of Jehovah must mean the old conflicts for the possession of the land; and the composition of the book or the collection of the songs must be placed not later and probably earlier than the David-Solomon period, when the recollections were still fresh in the memory. The age of Moses is out of the Question" (Numeri, Deut. u. Jos., 123).

The connection clearly shows that at an early period a guild of men existed not unlike the Greek rhapsodists, who recited etc. The view that the poem is a satiric ode is held by Ewald, Keil, Sayce, Dillmann. Others, as Stade and E. Meyer, claim that the poem has nothing to do with the Amorites, but is a triumphal ode celebrating a victory over Moab at a much later date. In any event, the Mashalim were an order of long standing in Israel.

before the people the old songs and poems of the nation.⁴ We shall not err much either way, if we regard the nucleus of the Book of the Wars of Jehovah" as originating shortly after the events celebrated and as committed to writing already in the period of the Judges. Whatever the date of composition, it is clear that written sources existed in the early days of the Judges.⁵

II. THE BOOK OF JASHAR.

1. At the battle of Gibeon, Joshua said:

"Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon;
And thou, Moon, in the valley of Ajalon.
And the sun stood still and the moon stayed
Until the nation had avenged themselves of their enemies.

Is not this written in the Book of Jashar?" (Josh. 10: 12-13).

What was the character and the date of this Book? "It was probably a collection, rhythmical in form, and poetical in diction, of various pieces celebrating the heroes of the Hebrew nation, and their achievements. . . . The book was naturally compiled by degrees, and gradually any ode or song deemed worthy of preservation added to it" (Maclear, Cambridge Bible, p. 89). Since the word *hayyashar* means the "Righteous One," the book may have been a record of the deeds of

* It is easy to imagine how these reciters went about in Israel and, especially in time of war, by reciting poems like the present (compare Is. 4: 4; Hab. 2: 6) and thus recalling former victories, stimulated and encouraged the people (Judges 5: 31). But possibly the repertoire of these ballad-singers was not confined to odes of war and victory (Gray, Numbers, p. 299).

* Any one caring to see a good example of the self-refutation of a certain type of textual and literary criticism will find it in T. K. Cheyne's article in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, col. 5271, where the absurd Jerahmeel hypothesis is brought to bear on this subject, and the contention put forth that there was probably no *Sepher Milhamoth* at all, but rather a *Sepher Yerahmeel*, i. e., "the book, or list, of Jerahmeel," "a geographical survey"!

righteous men.⁶ It will be observed that the verses 1-11, and 16-27 read continuously, while 12-15 break into the narrative and indicate an insertion. Whether the author of chapter ten, or another, incorporated the matter relating to the standing still of the sun, the citation of the Book of Jashar proves that sources and documents were preserved in that early period and were available for literary purposes.

2. The second and only other reference to this book in the Hebrew Bible is in 2 Sam. 1: 17, 18: "And David lamented with this lamentation over Saul and over Jonathan his son (and he bade them teach the children of Judah the song of the bow: behold it is written in the Book of Jashar)." In v. 18 the Hebrew text, which has no word for "the song of," might be translated literally, "teach the children of Israel the bow." But what can this mean? The text as it stands is in some confusion, for this lamentation of v. 17, would seem to refer to the dirge in vs. 19-27. How then can "the bow," which is said to be written in the Book of Jashar, mean the following dirge? Was the dirge known both as "a lamentation" and as "the song of the Bow"? It is immaterial here how these questions are answered; the fact remains that in this comparatively early stratum of the Old Testament we have a distinct reference to an ancient book doubtless preserved in the Hebrew archives and available for reference. According to Driver, "it was not compiled before the time of

⁶ The quotation here does not prove that the Book of Joshua was composed after the date of the reference in 2 Sam. 1: 18 (David's time), and as little is the reference there a proof that the first part of the book was not extant in the pre-Davidic period. Josephus testifies that books other than the canonical were laid up in the Temple (*Antiquities*, V: 1, 17).

⁷ All the later critics, as Ewald, G. A. Smith, Perles, Wellhausen, Holzinger, Driver and H. P. Smith have discussed the passage and attempted a restoration of the text. Driver states the difficulties, but offers no solution (*Notes on Samuel*). Wellhausen is equally unsatisfactory (*Buecher Samuelis*). H. P. Smith says: "We can do nothing with the text as it stands, and the efforts of all the commentators only bring the difficulty more clearly into relief" (*Commentary on Books of Samuel*, 259).

David, though the nucleus of the collection may obviously have been formed earlier" (*Literature*, p. 114). So also Reuss.

It is probable that the Book of Jashar is referred to in another passage. In closing the description of Solomon's dedication of the Temple, the Septuagint in 1 Kings 8: 53, adds: "Is not this written in the Book of the Song?" Since the Hebrew for "the Righteous" is *hayyashar* and for "the Song" *hashshir*, and since in the absence of the vowel-points in the Hebrew as originally written, a confusion could easily occur, it is probable that the Septuagint translators mistook the one for the other. The Syriac similarly confounds the two words, rendering Josh. 10: 13 "book of hymna, or praises," and 2 Sam. 1: 18, "book of Ashir." It is not likely that the Septuagint added the clause without warrant. It would seem then that the Book of Jashar contained an account of the foundation of the Temple and was quoted by name in the Hebrew text used by the translators of the Book of Kings into Greek.⁸

⁸ This passage brings up the question whether the Massoretic or the Septuagint text is the better attested. Following Wellhausen, later critics, as W. R. Smith, Cheyne, Klostermann, Swete, Kittel regard the Sept. as reflecting the true reading. "As its very errors shew, it is a translation of a Hebrew original, and the Book of the Song from which it came is doubtless none other than the Book of Jashar" (Swete, *Introduc. O. T. in Greek*). "The addition really was found by the translators in Hebrew, not inserted out of their own head" (W. R. Smith, *O. T. in Jew. Ch.*). "Haashahir fortasse pro hayyashar" (Kittel, *Bib. HEBRA*). On the other hand, J. Halévy (*Révue Semitique*, VIII., pp. 218-25) maintains the priority of the Massoretic text, chiefly on the ground that the translator must have known the Book of Jashar and so could not have mistaken the word. Stade also (*Hebrew Text of Kings in SBOT*) holds that "there are other reasons which make it safer to adhere to the Massoretic text in this case. . . . In favor of its priority is the fact that these verses appear in their proper context while in the Sept. they are misplaced. . . . The first two hemistichs as restored by Wellhausen have no proper connection, while the sense of the first as restored by Klostermann is forced. . . . But above all, it is conclusive that the Sept. elsewhere in Kings often follows a Hebrew text which must be explained as a modification of our present Massoretic text" (p. 102).

Various opinions have been entertained as to the extent of this lost book. Talmudists, Church Fathers, Medieval rabbis wrestled in vain with the problem; perhaps all would have assented to the conclusion of Theodoret "that the citations prove that other documents written by the prophets were made use of in the composition of the historical books." Current criticism may be summed up in the language of W. H. Bennett: "The data are too scanty and obscure to determine either the character of the book or the meaning of its title. As the passages quoted are ancient poems on great events, especially battles, probably the book was a collection of such poems" (*Hast. Dic. Bible*). At all events, the references show that already at an early period, books were in process of formation and were referred to as sources of further information.⁹

III. THE HISTORY OF SAMUEL THE SEER.

1 Chron. 29: 29: "Now the acts of David the king, first and last, behold they are written in the history (Hebrew, *words*) of Samuel the seer, and in the history of Nathan the prophet, and in the history of Gad the seer." It has been held that the first of these works is the extant Book of Samuel, since certain sections of Samuel and Chronicles agree almost verbally. But a closer examination shows that the document quoted by the Chronicler was considerably more extensive than our canonical Samuel. The natural inference is that the authors of Samuel and of Chronicles quoted from a history of Samuel now lost.

*The *Sepher hayyashar* has given rise to a curious literature. The Targum saw in it "the book of the law"; and the rabbis variously understood it as referring to Genesis, Deuteronomy, Judges, and even the Minor Prophets. The opinion of Gershom that it was one of the books that perished in the Babylonian Captivity was shared by Hottinger and other writers. In 1854 there appeared in London an ambitious work by Dr. Donaldson, who in the attempt at reconstruction included in it a considerable part of the Pentateuch and of the early historical books. There are also extant several rabbinical books with the same title. An interesting account of the speculations and imitations called forth by this lost work is found in *Literary Remains of Emanuel Deutsch*, pp. 440-8.

IV. THE HISTORY OF NATHAN THE PROPHET.

This is mentioned in 1 Chron. 29: 29 quoted above. As Nathan was a prophet of commanding influence at the court of David, and conversant with the real drift of events, we are not surprised that he wrote a history of that part of the reign of David with which he was especially familiar. In 2 Chron. 9. 29, we read: "Now the rest of the acts of Solomon, first and last, are they not written in the history of Nathan the prophet?" From this it may be inferred that he also wrote an account of Solomon's reign.¹⁰

V. THE HISTORY OF GAD THE SEER.

The above passage in Chronicles likewise mentions this work. The prophet Gad was counsellor of David in early life (1 S. 22: 5). Subsequently he announced the divine condemnation of the royal census (2 S. 24: 11), and advised the erection of an altar on Araunah's threshing-floor (2 S. 24: 18). He was therefore qualified to write a history of the first part of David's reign. In regard to these three lost books on the reign of David, it may be remarked that the events in the king's life must have been well known to Samuel and in the schools of the prophets, and that they would take steps to keep a complete record. This is confirmed by 1 S. 19: 18: "Now David fled, and escaped, and came to Samuel to Ramah and told him all that Saul had done to him. And he and David went and dwelt in Naioth," the seat of the society of the prophets.

¹⁰ Alas! of all the lost works of antiquity, is there any, heathen or sacred, to be named with the loss of the biography of David by the prophet Nathan? We can, however, form some notion of these lost books by the fragments of the historical writings that are left to us in the Prophetical Books of Isaiah and Jeremiah, and also by the likelihood that some of the present canonical books were founded upon the more ancient works which they themselves must have tended to supersede (Stanley, *History of the Jewish Church*, Vol. I., p. 395).

VI. THE CHRONICLES OF KING DAVID.

1 C. 27: 24: "Neither was the number put into the account in the chronicles of King David." As this passage stands in the account of the numbering of the people, the chronicler doubtless means that the details of the census were not entered in the official records. The book would thus appear to have contained among other matters, a transcript of statistical tables. "From them may have been derived the formal summaries of wars such as are given in 2 S. 8: 1-15, and lists of officials such as those in 2 S. 8: 16-18; 20: 23-26; 23: 8-39 (Kirkpatrick, Samuel, p. 11)."

VII. THE LAST WORDS OF DAVID.

1 C. 23: 27: "For by the last words of David the sons of Levi were numbered." The American Revision, margin, reads, "in the last acts," which is preferable. A more literal rendering of the Hebrew is: "In the last acts of David is the numbering of Levi from twenty years old and upwards." Under this view of the text, the reference is doubtless to a lost book of annals or statistics, perhaps similar to the preceding work.

VIII. THE BOOK OF THE ACTS OF SOLOMON.

In the Books of Kings three documentary sources are mentioned: (1) The Book of the Acts of Solomon, 1 K. 11: 41; (2) The Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Israel, 1 K. 14: 19; (3) The Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah, 1 K. 14: 29. That these are independent works is shown by the fact that for the history of Solomon only the first is cited; for the history of the kings of Israel only the second; and for the history of the kings of Judah only the third. It follows, "That the three documents contained more than the author has incorporated into his work and were more complete; and that not only were they in existence at the time our books were composed, but they were in the hands, if not of all, of many nevertheless, and circulated generally. For if

they were only submitted to his inspection, he could not have appealed to them, and referred his readers to them. In many respects it is well to bear this in mind" (Baehr, in Lange, p. 3).¹¹

Concerning the book before us, it is recorded, 1 K. 11: 41: "The rest of the acts of Solomon, and all that he did, and his wisdom, are they not written in the book of the acts of Solomon?" The Chronicler records, 2 C. 9: 29: "The rest of the acts of Solomon, first and last, are they not written in the history of Nathan the prophet, and in the prophecy of Ahijah, the Shilonite and in the visions of Iddo the Seer concerning Jeroboam the son of Nebat?"¹² The language and the style of Chronicles resemble so closely this part of the Book of Kings that the source for the author of both was probably the same, known to one as the Book of the Acts of Solomon, and to the other under the three titles mentioned above.¹³

Some critics are of the opinion that the work cited in 1 K. 11: 41 and the three sources of 2 C. 9: 29, are identical, but known under different titles. It is more probable that the latter books covered a wider range and were the sources of the

¹¹ Whole paragraphs in our Kings and Chronicles are practically identical. Compare 1 K. 8: 12-50 and 2 C. 6: 1-39 and 8: 2-10; 1 K. 8: 64-9: 9 and 2 C. 7: 7-23; 1 K. 9: 17-23 and 2 C. 9: 1-28; 1 K. 10: 1-28 and 2 C. 9: 1-28. This would imply that our Chronicler quoted from Kings, or followed closely the original sources.

¹² We have not space to consider the lost songs of Solomon. "His songs were a thousand and five," 1 K. 4: 32. "He spake three thousand proverbs," 1 K. 4: 32. Only a fraction of these are preserved in the canonical Scriptures.

¹³ It is not quite clear whether the name of the prophet indicates the author, or the subject of the history; the literal rendering of the Hebrew, "the words (*dibere*) of Nathan the prophet," "the prophecy (*nebuah*) of Ahijah" and "the visions (*chazoth*) of Iddo" favors the former view. In 2 C. 26: 22 we are told that Isaiah wrote a history of Uzziah: "Now the rest of the acts of Uzziah, first and last, did Isaiah, the prophet, the son of Amoz, write." Thus it is certain that the prophets were the authors of historical books; and we are therefore justified in holding that the book of the Acts of Solomon was composed largely of excerpts from prophetic writings, and perhaps chiefly from the three mentioned in 2 C. 9: 29.

former. However, this is immaterial here, for in either case our contention is established, that historical literature was extensively cultivated in the time of Solomon, and that chronicles, narratives and histories, as well as prophecies in the special sense, were written out by the prophets.¹⁴

IX. THE PROPHECY OF AHIJAH.

2 C. 9: 29. See under VIII. 1 K. 11: 28-40 narrates how by divine direction Ahijah clothed with a new garment meets Jeroboam and announces the success of the revolution, and promises the divine favor, if he observe Jehovah's statutes and commandments. "Years pass by; Jeroboam has realized his ambition, but not the ideal set before him by the prophet. His eldest son falls sick. The king bethinks himself of the true seer, now old and blind, and sends his wife in disguise." But the prophet through a divine revelation unmasks the deception and foretells the death of the child and the end of Jeroboam's house. See the graphic account in 1 K. 1: 18. As a true and gifted prophet, he doubtless wrote a theocratic history of the period beginning with Solomon and ending with Rehoboam.

X. THE BOOK OF THE CHRONICLES OF THE KINGS OF ISRAEL.

The author of the Book of Kings constantly refers to other authorities for matter not given in his work. One of these, the Acts of Solomon, we have just examined. A second is the Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Israel. This work is cited as the source in the case of seventeen kings, as follows:

"The prophetic spirit and the religious drift of all we read in the history is thus accounted for. . . . The whole purpose of the narrative in First Kings is to picture Solomon's life a success, and the building of the Temple as acceptable, in so far as the one was led in the fear of Jehovah, and the other as a token of obedience to the divine will. . . . A record of such a character is the composition of no mere historiographer, but bears on the face of it the imprint of prophetic hands" (J. R. Lumby, *First Kings*).

Jeroboam I. (1 K. 14: 19); Nadab (15: 31); Baasha (16: 5); Elah (16: 14); Zimri (16: 20); Omri (16: 27); Ahab (22: 39); Ahaziah (2 K. 1: 18); Jehu (10: 34); Jehoahaz (13: 8); Joash (13: 12); Jeroboam II. (14: 28); Zechariah (15: 11); Shallum (15: 15); Menahem (15: 22); Pekahiah (15: 26) and Pekah (15: 31); all who reigned in the Northern Kingdom except Jehoram and Hoshea (that these names are omitted is a proof that the book received no additions after the reign of Pekah, *circa*, 733 B. C.). Our Books of Chronicles do not treat except incidentally of the history of the Northern Kingdom, and hence have no occasion to cite authorities for the Kings of Israel. Such histories must, however, have been drawn up, since they are mentioned under various titles in the accounts of the Kings of Judah.¹⁵

Even in the case of matter for which no authorities are cited, we must infer from the style and minute details, that the author of our kings had abundant documentary proof at command. Since he sees fit to cite authorities for further investigation, it is reasonable to suppose that either the three above-named sources, or others of like character, were drawn upon for the remainder of his material. Driver holds that for the longer narratives he is indebted to various independent sources. Their authors were in all probability prophets—in

¹⁵ "These authorities are always referred to for information respecting the kings, their buildings, warlike enterprises, and other undertakings. It may be safely inferred from the character of these references that the 'Books of Chronicles' were of a political character; they contained notices of the public and official doings of the several kings. The expression *chronicles* (literally, *words*, or *acts of days*) is the proper term used to denote an official journal, or minutes of events: 1 C. 27: 24 it is implied that the results of David's census would in the ordinary course of things have been included in the chronicles of his reign. . . . Now it appears from 2 S. 8: 16; 20: 24; 1 K. 4: 3; 2 K. 18: 18, 37; 2 C. 34: 8, that David, Solomon and Josiah had among their ministers one who bore the title of recorder (literally, *remembrancer*, *mazkir*) and it may reasonably be inferred that the other kings as well had a similar minister. It can hardly be doubted that the function of this minister was to keep an official record of the public events of the reign, such as would be denoted by *dibere hayyamim*" (Driver, *Literature*).

most cases, prophets belonging to the Northern Kingdom; though the data do not exist for identifying them, in individual cases.

Since now the date of the compilation of the Books of Kings is about 560 B. C., and since the author constantly cites his sources or is supposed to draw from them, we have in fact a work based on original documents carrying us back to a period contemporaneous with the events described. Thus the highest degree of historicity is attained, due largely to histories and chronicles written in the successive periods. We have therefore reason to believe that our Kings and Chronicles are correct and trustworthy records.

XI. THE HISTORY OF SHEMAIAH THE PROPHET.

2 C. 12: 15: "Now the acts of Rehoboam, first and last, are they not written in the histories of Shemaiah the prophet and of Iddo the seer, after the manner of genealogies?" Shemaiah the prophet announced the divine sanction of Jeroboam's rebellion against Rehoboam: "Thus saith Jehovah. . . . This thing is from me," 2 C. 11: 2-4. He also reprobated Rehoboam for having forsaken Jehovah. At the word of Jehovah he prophesied a deliverance from Shishak's invasion, 2 C. 12: 4-8. He was therefore in a position to write a history of Rehoboam's reign.

XII. THE VISIONS OF IDDO THE SEER.

Iddo, known as seer (*chozeh*) and prophet (*nabi*), is cited by the Chronicler as an authority for the reigns of three kings: (1) Solomon, 2 C. 9: 29: "The rest of the acts of Solomon are they not written in the visions of Iddo the seer?"; (2) Rehoboam, 2 C. 12: 15: "The acts of Rehoboam are they not written in the history of Iddo the seer?"; (3) Abijah, 2 C. 13: 22.

XIII. THE HISTORY OF IDDO THE SEER.

Cited in 2 C. 12: 15. See preceding. Josephus (*Antiq.*, VIII.: 8, 5) adopts the tradition that the prophet who denounced Jeroboam, 1 K. 13, was Jaddo, perhaps Iddo.

XIV. THE COMMENTARY OF THE PROPHET IDDO.

2 C. 13: 22: "The rest of the acts of Abijah . . . are written in the commentary of the Prophet Iddo." The account of Abijah's victory, 2 C. 13: 3 f., was probably taken from this work. The term translated commentary (*midrash*) occurs in the Old Testament only here and 2 C. 24: 27. It means a didactic development of historical events in the interest of higher religious truth. We know nothing more of the two books than their titles. Possibly the Commentary of Iddo is to be identified with the preceding; or the three may have been one work under three titles.

XV. THE HISTORY OF JEHU.

2 C. 20: 34: "Now the rest of the acts of Jehoshaphat, first and last, behold they are written in the history (*words*) of Jehu, the son of Hanani, which is inserted in the Book of the Kings of Israel." Jehu predicted the downfall and destruction of the house of Baasha, 1 K. 16: 1-7, 12. He also denounced Jehoshaphat for his alliance with Ahab, 2 C. 19: 2. The author of our Chronicles quotes sometimes from such histories as parts of a larger work. In this case the history is viewed as a part of the Book of the Kings of Israel. This Jehu who had prophesied against Baasha some thirty years previously, would be qualified to write a history from the theocratic standpoint.

XVI. THE ACTS OF UZZIAH.

2 C. 26: 22: "The rest of the acts of Uzziah . . . did Isaiah, the prophet, . . . write." Since it is not stated that Isaiah wrote a special book of the acts of Uzziah, we may suppose that he wrote a history of the reign, and incorporated it at once in the book of the Kings of Judah.

XVII. THE VISION OF ISAIAH.

2 C. 32: 32: "The rest of the acts of Hezekiah and his good deeds, behold, they are written in the vision of Isaiah,

the prophet, the son of Amoz, in the Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel." "The vision of Isaiah" can not be the canonical book of the prophet (although that is called in general the vision of Isaiah in 1: 1), for the acts of Hezekiah are not described therein at great length. The book in which it was inserted was not our canonical Kings, but the book mentioned in 1 C. 9: 21; 16: 11; and 2 C. 25: 26, in case these are the same and not different books.

XVIII. THE HISTORY OF HOZAI, OR OF THE SEERS.

2 C. 33: 18, 19: "The rest of the acts of Manasseh, and his prayer . . . behold they are written among the acts of the Kings of Israel . . . behold they are written in the history of Hozai." Although the titles do not agree exactly, the first-named of these books and "the Book of the Kings of Israel" are probably the same work. It is possible that Hozai is the name of a prophet, but if so, we have no further account of him. Since the word literally means the "Seers" it is better to render as in the American Revision, margin, "the Book of the Seers."

XIX. THE COMMENTARY OF THE BOOK OF KINGS.

2 C. 24: 27: "Now concerning his (Joash's) sons . . . behold they are written in the Commentary of the Book of Kings." As stated above, this is the only other passage in which the word *Midrash* occurs. Some would identify the book with the Acts of the Kings of Israel, 2 C. 33: 18. "On the one hand the peculiar title would suggest a distinct work: on the other hand, it is not apparent why, if (as the title shows) it was a comprehensive work, dealing with the kings generally, it should be cited for one reign only" (Driver, Lit.).

XX. THE BOOK OF THE KINGS OF JUDAH AND ISRAEL.

2 C. 16: 11 (Asa); 25: 16 (Amaziah); 28: 16 (Ahaz); 32: 32 (Hezekiah).

XXI. THE BOOK OF THE KINGS OF ISRAEL AND JUDAH.

2 C. 27: 7 (Jotham); 35: 26 (Josiah); 36: 8 (Jehoiakim).

XXII. THE ACTS OF THE KINGS OF ISRAEL.

2 C. 33: 18 (Manasseh).

XXIII. THE BOOK OF THE KINGS OF ISRAEL.

1 C. 9: 1: "So all Israel were reckoned by genealogies; and, behold they are written in the book of the kings of Israel." Critics generally hold that numbers XX.-XXII. are different names of one and the same work, which contained a history of both kingdoms and whose full title was "the Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah," but which was sometimes referred to more briefly. That the compiler refers to one book, and not two or three, seems clear from these considerations: (1) the book with the full title is cited as the authority for the reigns of Josiah and Jehoiakim, i. e., after the Northern Kingdom had fallen; (2) the shorter title, "kings of Israel" is employed for Jehoshaphat, and Manasseh, kings of Judah.¹⁸

XXIV. THE WRITING OF DAVID AND OF SOLOMON.

In the account of Josiah's preparation for the celebration of the Passover, we have, 2 C. 35: 4: "Prepare yourselves after your fathers' houses by your courses according to the writing of David king of Israel and according to the writing of Solomon his son." In an earlier passage, the Chronicler describes David's pattern of the Temple and adds: "All this, said David, have I been made to understand in writing from the hand of Jehovah, even all the works of this pattern," 1 C. 28: 19. (Some think that the "writing" was not a

"It is true that the Chronicler explicitly appeals to none of the documents named as authorities for what he states, but only as repositories of (further) information. Nevertheless, it is probable that the Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel, cited under different names, is the main source of Ch. The many agreements with S and K prove that Ch used either these books or some work based on these" (F. Brown, *Chronicles*, Hastings's).

book, but a plan or series of patterns shown in vision.) It would seem that the lost works here mentioned were notes or writings of David and Solomon in which were recorded the laws for the guidance of the priests and Levites in the sanctuary.

XXV. THE LAMENTATIONS.

2 C. 35: 25: "And Jeremiah lamented for Josiah; and all the singing men and singing women spake of Josiah in their lamentation unto this day, and they made them an ordinance in Israel; and, behold, they are written in the Lamentations." That this is not our canonical book "Lamentations" is shown by the fact that the Hebrew word here rendered "Lamentations" is *quinoth*, the plural of the form *quinah* (occurring also in 2 S. 1: 17) which is the technical expression for a death-dirge. The title of our book "Lamentations" is *'ekah* in the Hebrew. Moreover, we search in vain in the canonical Lamentations for a funeral dirge over the devout Josiah.

XXVI. THE BOOK OF THE CHRONICLES OF THE KINGS OF JUDAH.

As noted above, the third of the sources cited by the author of our Kings is "the Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah," mentioned in fifteen passages: 1 K. 14: 29 (Rehoboam); 15: 7 (Abijah); 15: 23 (Asa); 22: 45 (Jehoshaphat); 2 K. 8: 23 (Joram); 12: 19 (Joash); 14: 18 (Amaziah); 15: 6 (Azariah); 15: 36 (Jotham); 16: 19 (Ahaz); 20: 20 (Hezekiah); 21: 17 (Manasseh); 21: 25 (Amon); 23: 28 (Josiah); 24: 5 (Jehoiakim). The formula for additional information is: "Now the rest of the acts of Rehoboam and all that he did are they not written in the book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah?" What now is the relation of this work to those already considered? It is evidently distinct from Nos. VIII. and X. above. But how is it related to the sources mentioned in our Chronicles? Diverse views have been entertained on this intricate problem. Since our

purpose is to show that the amount of written documents at the command of the Old Testament historian was much greater than is usually supposed, we are not concerned directly with the critical questions, but shall confine ourselves to the direct issue.

In order to have the facts well in hand we examine a few of the reigns somewhat closely.

1. Rehoboam. Our 1 K. 14: 29 refers for further information to the third source. In 2 C. 12: 15 we have: "Now the acts of Rehoboam . . . written in the histories of Shemaiah the prophet and of Iddo the seer, after the manner of genealogies?" Do our Kings and Chronicles mean the same work with different titles, or distinct books? By comparing 1 K. 12: 1-19 with 2 C. 10: 8-9; 1 K. 12: 20-24 with 2 C. 11: 1-4 and from other parts, it will be seen that the several parallels are substantially the same. As similar phenomena occur in the rest of our Chronicles, the claim may naturally be made that the Chronicler quotes from our Kings; but he refers in specific terms to the histories of Shemaiah and of Iddo. Does he wish us to infer that for what he gives he has drawn on our Kings, but for any desired additional matter he recommends these works? This is a possible inference. It is also possible that since he recommends these works they were likewise his sources. In either case the perplexity increases.

2. Abijah. The account of the reign of Abijah in 1 K. is very brief, but the author refers to the third source for further details. On the other hand our 2 C. 13: 22 directs attention to "the commentary of the prophet Iddo" for additional information. Was this latter at the date of the Chronicler still a separate book, or had it been incorporated into a larger work but still quoted under its original title?

3. From an examination of the remaining reigns it will be seen that our Kings uniformly directs attention for additional matter to the third source, except in the case of Ahaziah, Jehoahaz, Jehoiada and Zedekiah.

4. What now is the relation of these various sources? Did the Chronicler quote not merely from our Kings, but also from the other works? One view is that the sources of our Kings are identical with the chief written authorities of Chronicles, since the language in the parallel passages is nearly the same. The author of Kings, however, had before him, in addition to the Book of the Acts of Solomon, two distinct works, one relating to the Northern, the other to the Southern Kingdom; the Chronicler, if using the same works, must have known them as united. This is rendered probable both by the joint title and by references to the Book of the Kings of Israel even after the Northern Kingdom had fallen.¹⁷

Of this scheme Driver says: "It is only approximate. It takes no account of the elements in the existing Kings or Chronicles derived from other sources—in the former, for instance, from prophetic narratives, in the latter from genealogical and other records. It must be admitted also that we do not *know* that (1) and (2) were used in the compilation of (4); the materials used may have been obtained from other sources, even including (3)" (*Literature*).

XXVII. THE LOST PROVERBS OF SOLOMON.

There must have been intense literary activity in the two and a half centuries between Solomon and Hezekiah, for we are told, Proverbs, 25: 1, "These also are proverbs of Solomon, which the men of Hezekiah copied out," the reference being to chapters 25–29 inclusive.¹⁸ The peculiarities of

"The relation of these books is indicated in the following scheme:

- (1) The Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Israel.
- (2) The Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah.

(3) The Canonical Book of Kings. (4) The Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah.

(5) The Canonical Book of Chronicles.

"Prof. C. H. Toy allows that the men of Hezekiah are "the literary men of the court," but he proceeds, "the period would in these regards be an appropriate one, but the history of Israelitish literature makes it

language and matter bear witness to the gradual growth of the Book of Proverbs. Since Solomon is said to have spoken three thousand proverbs (1 K. 4: 32) and the number transmitted is only about 540 (some of which are repeated) it is probable that several collections of his proverbs were extant, and that scribes gathered into one book such as suited a religious purpose. The word translated "copied out," meaning also "compiled," "arranged in order," may indicate either one book or many as the source of the collection. Whether Hezekiah's men merely copied out, or also compiled and edited is immaterial, since under any view some book or record existed from which they selected. The view of some that these proverbs were handed down orally is wholly without support.

XXVIII. THE LOST SOURCES OF THE BOOKS OF EZRA AND NEHEMIAH.

The Books of Ezra and Nehemiah (a continuation of Chronicles) are drawn up largely on the basis of documents deposited in Jerusalem and in the Persian archives. That the books are compilations is evident from the style and the matter.¹⁹ In the original Hebrew canon the books are listed as one and may be so regarded. The author (whoever he

improbable that such a work should then have been undertaken; to regard Hezekiah as a Jewish Pisiistratus (Del.) is to ascribe to the time a literary spirit of which our documents give no hint" (Proverbs, p. 458). We venture to believe that the evidence is strongly the other way.

¹⁹ It is well to recall the synopsis of these books and the approximate dates. *I. The Restoration*, first six chapters of Ezra (except 4: 7-24): (1) chaps. 1-3, the return from Babylon and foundation of Second Temple (537); (2) chaps. 4: 1-6, and chaps. 5 and 6, Samaritan opposition and completion of Temple (536; 520-516). Then the period of 58 years' silence (516-458). *II. The Foundation of Judaism*, under Ezra and Nehemiah (458-432): (1) Ezra, chaps. 7-10, the mission of Ezra (458-457); (2) Ezra 4: 7-24, hostility to Jews; (3) Neh., chaps. 1-12, Nehemiah's governorship (445-444); (4) Nehemiah's second visit, Neh. 13 (432). Persian rulers: Cyrus, 558-529; Cambyzes, 529-522; Darius Hystaspes, 522-485; Xerxes, 485-465; Artaxerxes I., 465-425; Xerxes II. and Sogdianus, 425; Darius II. Nothus, 424-405; Artaxerxes II., 405-359.

may have been) made free use of abundant sources at his command. These included the memoirs of Ezra and of Nehemiah, official lists of names, and various Hebrew and Aramaic chronicles. In recent years a spirited controversy has sprung up regarding the date and authenticity of these sources. That the Aramaic sections of Ezra, viz., 4: 8 to 6: 18; 7: 12-26, are derived from an older source is universally admitted; but imbedded in these Aramaic sections are letters, decrees and rescripts which are themselves transcripts of sources no longer extant. Had the compiler access to the originals or to authenticated copies? Were they genuine? Did he perhaps re-edit or condense them? Is it likely that such rescripts as those of Artaxerxes (Ez. 4: 17-22), Cyrus (6: 3-5) and Darius (6: 6-12) are genuine? It is evident that one's attitude toward these questions will determine his conclusions as to the trustworthiness of the books.

From a reference to "the Book of the Chronicles," Neh. 12: 23, it has been inferred that there was extant a post-exilic, as there had been a pre-exilic, work embodying the history of the Jewish commonwealth. E. Meyer conjectures that it was written chiefly in the Aramaic, the author availing himself of the Hebrew only in quotations from the Hebrew sources (*Entstehung*, 20). The sources accessible to this chronicler were presumably a list of the returned exiles (the *gola*), an account of the building and the dedication of the Temple, the memoirs of Ezra and Nehemiah, and state documents. All recent authorities agree that abundant material was at the service of the author of Ezra-Nehemiah; but the trustworthiness of this material and the treatment of it are in dispute. We propose to inquire into the character and credibility of the lost records.²⁰

²⁰ *Recent Controversy on the Sources.* In 1890, A. Van Hoonacker, professor at Louvain, undertook to show that while Nehemiah's activity in Jerusalem was in 445-444 and 432 B. C., Ezra's mission took place under Artaxerxes II. about 400. In 1893, W. H. Kusters, another Dutch scholar, advanced the hypothesis that there was no return under Cyrus, that the Temple was rebuilt by the Jews remaining in Palestine (520-

XXIX. THE LOST MEMOIRS OF EZRA.

Extracts from the so-called personal memoirs of Ezra, found chiefly in Ezra 7: 27 to 9: 15, are distinguishable by the use of the first person singular. Here Ezra is clearly the speaker and as clearly the author of this part of the book. Was he also the author of the remainder? No, says the literary critic, for the abrupt change to the third person implies another than Ezra. It is, however, to be noted that the

516) and the walls restored only under Nehemiah, in 445. The first general return was under Ezra, and the law was promulgated, not in 444, but in 432. Kusters challenged the authenticity of the Ezra-Nehemiah documents and reconstructed *ad libitum*. In 1896, Van Hoonacker reiterated his position in the epoch-making work on the "Restoration." These investigations of the Dutch scholars have been assailed by both the conservative and the liberal critics: by the former, because the new hypotheses seem to cut Ezra-Nehemiah into pieces and to leave no safe footing for the Restoration; by the latter, especially Kuenen and Wellhausen, because, if the Artaxerxes of Ezra-Nehemiah be the second of that name (so also Torrey, Marquart, H. P. Smith and others) the date of Nehemiah's first governorship was in 385, and Ezra's introduction of the law at the same date, or even later. This would necessitate a readjustment of the Wellhausen date of 444 for the Priest Code. *Hinc illa lachrymæ Wellhausenianæ*. In 1896, Eduard Meyer, the distinguished historian, instituted a searching investigation into the Persian and other documents in Ezra-Nehemiah and reached conclusions confirming in essentials the traditional view. About the same time, C. C. Torrey came to the diametrically opposite result, that, "aside from the greater part of Neh. 1-6, the book has no value whatever as history." In 1901, Sellin reviewed the whole subject and agreed with Kusters and Van Hoonacker that Ezra's mission followed that of Nehemiah, but he held that in other respects the traditional view is in the main correct. We are concerned here with the controversy only as it relates to the age and authenticity of the documents. We shall quote from recent special authorities, as follows: A. Van Hoonacker, *Néhémie et Esdras*, 1890; and *Nouvelles études sur la Restauration juive après l'exil de Babylone*, 1896. Kuenen, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, 1894. Kusters, *Die Wiederherstellung Israels in der persischen Periode*, 1895. Wellhausen, *Die Rueckkehr der Juden aus dem babylonischen Exil*, 1895; and *Goettingische Gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1897. E. Meyer, *Die Entstehung des Judenthums*, 1896. C. C. Torrey, *The Composition and Historical Value of Ezra-Nehemiah*, 1896. Cheyne, *Jewish Religious Life after the Exile*, 1898. Ernst Sellin, *Studien zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Juedischen Gemeinde nach dem Babylonischen Exil*, 1901.

style of the Book of Ezra reveals marked variations from that of the author of the canonical Chronicles; and it is possible that Ezra had a larger share in the composition of the book than critics generally concede. In any event it is probable that the original memoirs was a considerably larger work than the extant portions, and it may have included not only the whole period of his activity, but also a résumé of the history since the return under Zerubbabel. Under this view, the author of our Ezra in the parts written in the third person, draws chiefly from the memoirs, though following in part other sources. It is clear that a ready scribe like Ezra would leave extensive records.²¹

XXX. THE LOST MEMOIRS OF NEHEMIAH.

Quotations from the supposed memoirs of Nehemiah, which are likewise recognized by the character of the language, are found in Neh. 1: 1 to 7: 73; 12: 27-43 to 13: 4-31, and perhaps in other passages. Here too the word "I" referring unquestionably to Nehemiah, is used throughout. That such memoirs existed is the unanimous judgment of scholars.²² The only question is as to their extent and credibility. If Nehemiah wrote the Book of Nehemiah, as the old scholars held, and as certain peculiarities of style indicate, he of course faithfully transcribed from his memoirs; or, rather the theory of memoirs yields to that of an immediate composition. If, however, another writer, making liberal use of available

²¹ Critics even of the extreme left (except Kesters and Torrey) agree with Driver that these memoirs are reliable and authentic. "Nur vereinzelt ist an der Herkunft dieser Ich-Stuecke gezweifelt worden. Sie bleiben ohne diese Herkunft unverstaendlich; denn es ist nicht denkbar, dass ein Spaeterer, etwa der Chronist selbst, willkuerlich Ezra zum Theil in der ersten Person berichten lasse und dann doch wieder daneben in der dritten Person von Ezra rede" (Baudissin, Einleitung in d. Buech. A. T., 289).

²² "Als Kinder einer neuen Zeit zeugen sie [Ezra und Nehemia] sich dadurch, dass sie beide sich gedrungen gefuehlt haben, ihre Memoiren zu schreiben. Leider sind uns nur die des Nehemia vollstaendiger erhalten" (Wellhausen, Isre. u. Jued. Gesch., S. 173).

sources, composed Ezra-Nehemiah, the question of their character is fundamental.

XXXI. THE BOOK OF THE GENEALOGY OF THE RETURNED EXILES.

When the walls of Jerusalem had been repaired Nehemiah says: "And I found the book of the genealogy of them that came up at the first and I found written therein" (Neh. 7: 5). Then follows the list in 7: 6-73. Where did he find the names? Either in the post-exilic "book of the chronicles," or in the Temple archives, where Zerubbabel had deposited a list nearly a hundred years previously. See Ezra 2: 1-70, where substantially the same list is given. Recognizing the importance of the register, Nehemiah transfers it to his own history. "This long extract illustrates in an interesting manner the method of composition adopted by Jewish chroniclers" (Ryle, *Ez. and Neh.*, p. 232).

This being a test case, all the recent critics have discussed the accuracy and credibility at some length. Meyer declares that if the list be authentic, it must form the basis of all investigations regarding the post-exilian community (p. 95). Stade says: "This list must have been compiled shortly after the arrival in Jerusalem. . . . Having been carefully preserved in Jerusalem, it was subsequently found among the family registers by Nehemiah and incorporated in his memoirs" (*Gesch. d. Volkes Israel*, II., 98). Meyer, who shares with Van Hoonacker and Sellin the honor of having written the best account of the Restoration, has the most satisfactory discussion of these "Lists," his review superseding the work of Smend on the same subject. At the end of a linguistic and historical analysis covering a hundred pages, he formulates a series of propositions, the first two of which are: "1. The list contains the names only of families who returned from the Exile, not of those remaining behind. 2. The names of places are those of the homeless population carried into exile, not their residence after the Exile (*Entsteh.*,

p. 190)." Further: "All these arguments prove that the modern doubts are unfounded. No proof exists for questioning the correctness of the superscription in Ezra 2: 1, or for regarding Neh. 7: 5 as an interpolation" (p. 191). In short Meyer regards the list as entirely authentic, as "ein Aktenstueck officiellen Characters" (p. 102).

Kosters, Torrey, Cheyne, H. P. Smith ("ostensibly a register of those who returned from the Exile," "has no bearing on the first return" O. T. Hist., p. 347), deny practically all historical credibility;²³ Ryssel, Smend, Wellhausen, Stade, Ryle, Driver concede an underlying stratum of fact; Van Hoonacker, Meyer, Baudissin, Sellin, Klostermann have placed the historicity beyond a peradventure.

XXXII. LETTERS OF SAMARITANS TO ARTAXERXES.

These letters (4: 8-23) stand in the section of Ezra written, not in the Hebrew, but in the Aramaic. The employment of this language here is an unquestioned proof that the author of Ezra-Nehemiah made direct use of original sources deposited in the Persian archives or in Jerusalem, and did not deem it desirable to translate. Since the Aramaic in one or the other of its dialects had been for centuries a kind of *lingua franca*, or medium of international intercourse in the districts between the Euphrates and the Mediterranean, and was understood at this time by the Jews, it was not absolutely necessary to employ the Hebrew; and since the additional purpose would be served of reproducing the letters in this section in their original form, the author retains the Aramaic, with some minor dialectic changes.

Coming now to the letters, we notice that Ezra 4: 4-16,

²³ These writers apparently adopt the view that a historical document must be considered spurious until its genuineness has been established. The true principle, that a historical document is to be considered genuine until its spuriousness has been established is well formulated by Meyer: "Bei einem aus historischer Zeit ueberlieferten Dokument steht die Beweispflicht den Angreifern der Aechtheit zu, nicht den Vertheidigern" (Entsteh., p. 6).

relates various acts of hostility against the returned exiles by "the people of the land," i. e., chiefly the Samaritans. The first of these occurred "all the days of Cyrus, king of Persia, even until the reign of Darius (4: 4-5)." Then "in the reign of Ahasuerus in the beginning of his reign, wrote they an accusation against the inhabitants of Judah and Jerusalem" (v. 6). Again "in the days of Artaxerxes wrote Bishlam, Mithredath, Tabeel, and the rest of his companions, unto Artaxerxes king of Persia: and the writing of the letter was in the Syrian (Aramaic) character, and set forth in the Syrian tongue (v. 7)." Further, "Rehum the chancellor and Shimshai the scribe wrote a letter against Jerusalem to Artaxerxes the king in this sort, etc." (v. 8).

The common view is that verses 7-10 refer to a letter written jointly by Bishlam and his associates, and by Rehum and Shimshai, assumed Persian officials. But this does not explain the relation of the names. It seems better to regard verses 6, 7 and 8 as describing three several occasions on which letters were written to the king by the Samaritans, or other enemies of the Jews. Nothing further is said or known of the letter to Ahasuerus (Xerxes) v. 6. The author goes on to speak of the two written accusations in the days of Artaxerxes. Only the substance of the first letter, written by Bishlam and others, is recorded here, but the greater part, if not the whole of the second (omitting the usual lengthy salutation) is reproduced. Thus of the three letters mentioned, only one is extant; however, the loss is not great. The text as it stands is in some confusion, and we are unable to determine absolutely either the number or the date of the letters.²⁴

²⁴ The generally accepted view is that 4: 8-24 is out of place and refers to the Ezra-Nehemiah period; but Sellin presents an unusually strong argument for the old view that it is in the right place and refers to the Darius I. period. He argues that the names of Cambyses and Darius stood in the original writing, but that, just as in Josephus, Xerxes is known also as Cyrus and Artaxerxes, so here, the compiler of Ezra, writing a century after the events and neglecting to note the order of the

XXXIII. THE REPLY OF ARTAXERXES.

The reply of Artaxerxes, forbidding the further rebuilding of the city, is brief and probably contains only an abstract of the original decree, Ezra 4: 17-22. The rescript says that search having been made, it was found that the city of old time had made insurrection against kings, verse 19. The reference to "the book of the records," verse 15 (probably not merely Persian annals, but also Babylonian and Assyrian chronicles of the pre-Persian period, containing accounts of hostile acts of the kings of Judah and Israel), implies that minute records of all political movements were kept. We may be sure that Artaxerxes, as well as Cyrus, Darius and Xerxes before him, caused all the letters, decrees and documents of every description relating to the Jews to be carefully recorded, so that Ezra and Nehemiah could well have had access to, or procured copies of, genuine and authentic documents. When it is remembered that the Persian kings caused their firmans to be published generally in at least three languages, we may confidently conclude that copies would find their way to the most remote provinces.

XXXIV. THE LETTER OF TATTENAI TO DARIUS.

Tattenai, the Persian governor, desiring instruction in regard to allowing the rebuilding of the Temple, writes to Darius (Ezra 5: 6-17) whether a decree to that effect had been issued by Cyrus. This letter is in the Biblical or Western Aramaic; but since the dialect used by this high Persian official (presumably a *pechah* above the local *pechahs*, and so above Sheshbazzar, cf. verses 6 and 14) may be supposed to have been the Eastern Aramaic, the necessary dialectic changes were made. The student of the Aramaic

Persian rulers, substituted Xerxes and Artaxerxes for the two earlier kings. "Sowohl der Inhalt von 4: 8-23 wie die Tradition ueber diesen Abschnitt fuehren uns zwingend darauf, dass derselbe ein Ereigniss vor der Regierung des Darius behandelt. In diesem Falle fallen alle sachlichen Bedenken gegen die Echtheit der Urkunden dahin" (Studien, p. 24).

will observe that two different words for letter occur, *iggarta* (Emph. from *igra*), v. 6, and *pithgama* (Emph. from *pithgam*), v. 7, the former a letter in general, the latter, a report, V. 11; the discrimination is a mark of historicity. The term "lost" may be applied to this letter only in the sense that the Aramaic original is no longer extant.²⁵ Then follows the account of the finding of the decree of Cyrus.

XXXV. THE ROLL OF THE DECREE OF CYRUS.

In Ezra 1: 1 it is recorded that "Cyrus made proclamation throughout all his kingdom and put it also in writing," that the Jews should be liberated and the Temple rebuilt. This statement is intended to show that the edict had been written at the command of the king and preserved in the archives as well as published throughout the kingdom.²⁶ In answer to the letter of Tattenai, "Darius the king made a decree, and search was made in the house of the archives where the treasures were laid up in Babylon. And there was found

²⁵ "Es ist bisher kein Argument, litterarischer oder sachlicher Art, erbracht, welches uns berechtigt, an der vollen Glaubwuerdigkeit von Ezra 5: 1-6: 15 zu zweifeln. Vielmehr verraet sich ueberall ein sachlich gut orientierter, unmittelbar noch die aramaisch-persischen Urkunden benutzender und von einer besonderen Tendenz freier Verfasser, wie besonders aus einem Vergleiche mit 1: 1 ff. erhellt" (Sellin, Entstehungsgeschichte, S. 12).

²⁶ Prof. H. P. Smith holds that "the difficulties in accepting this account as it stands, are of the most serious character. . . . The alleged proclamation is in a style unknown to the genuine edicts of the Persian kings. . . . All that we know of the Persian readiness to acknowledge and protect all sorts of sanctuaries does not justify the sweeping language of the proclamation" (O. T. History, pp. 344-5). This sentence without the negative is a defensible proposition. Kisters, Torrey and Smith line up together. Van Hoonacker, Meyer and Sellin furnish proof for the authenticity of the decree. "Seit wir wissen, wie Kambyases und Darius in den aegyptischen Inschriften als treue Diener der einheimischen Goetter auftreten, wie Kyros in seiner Proclamation an die Babylonier sich als den eifrigsten Verehrer und den erklarten Liebling des Marduk einfuehrt, duerfte niemand daran Anstoss nehmen, wenn sich ein Perserkoenig den Juden gegenueber in gleicher Weise aeusserte" (Meyer, Entsteh., p. 64).

at Achmetha, in the palace that is in the province of Media, a roll, and therein was thus written for a record, etc. (6: 1-2)." Then follows the decree, vs. 3-5, which is obviously a condensation of the original. Here is explicit mention of "the house of the archives" (Aramaic *sipherayya*, books), a library in which the state documents, even those relating to distant provinces of the empire, were preserved.²⁷ "The edicts of Cyrus in this matter were published either simply in Persian, or, as in the case of the extant inscriptions of Persian kings, in Persian, Babylonian and Susianian" (Stade, *Gesch.*, II., 99). No reasonable doubt can be entertained as to the historical character of the edict. Stade continues: "That Cyrus with royal generosity decreed to rebuild

²⁷ Kusters sees an inconsistency in the statement, vs. 1 and 2, that search was made "in Babylon" and a roll was found "in Achmetha" and argues that the author unskillfully excerpted from two documents ("die zwei Namen weisen zurick auf zwei Erzählungen, deren eine Babel, die andere Achmetha nannte," *Wiederherstellung*, p. 23); in short, had no adequate knowledge of the subject-matter, and accordingly the whole narrative is untrustworthy. Both Meyer and Van Hoonacker have exposed the fallacy of this reasoning. As this is a crucial point, and as Van Hoonacker touches on other interesting matter, we reproduce his critique: "En disant qu'on fit dans les archives de Babylone une enquête touchant un document officiel qui se retrouva à Ecbatane, il ne crée pas à la critique un bien redoutable problème. Il était à présumer que le décret royal dont se prévalaient les Juifs était déposé dans les archives de la grande ville qui, du moins pendant les premières années de la conquête, devait être restée le siège de l'administration pour les affaires des peuples soumis à l'ancien empire. Tattenai et son collègue font donc chose tout naturelle en priant le roi d'ordonner une enquête à Babylone et Darius lui-même devait s'attendre à trouver là les renseignements désirés. L'auteur qui mentionne la trouvaille faite à Ecbatane ne pouvait en juger autrement. La double mention d'Ecbatane et de Babylone n'est donc en aucune façon à considérer comme indice d'une double version. . . . La théorie de M. Kusters sur la composition des chap. V-VI du livre d'Esdras, n'a, croyons-nous, pas l'ombre d'un motif sérieux à alléguer en sa faveur. . . . Dans l'idée de l'auteur qui a écrit le verset 2, la pièce trouvée à Ecbatane se rapportait au décret porté par Cyrus en faveur du temple de Jerusalem. Or c'étaient précisément des renseignements sur le décret de Cyrus qu'on avait cherchés dans les archives de Babylone. Tout cela se tient aussi intimement que possible" (*Restauration Juive*, pp. 25, 26, 27).

the Temple at Jerusalem at the royal expense, is not incredible. The ancient Temple had been built by a renowned king of the past, as indeed the returned exiles boasted, Ez. 5: 11. It was therefore natural, that a king should undertake to restore it, especially since political considerations might be involved. . . . The credibility of the account is further attested by the fact that the Aramaic source of the Chronicler furnishes reliable data concerning other events (Gesch., II., p. 100)."

XXXVI. THE REPLY OF DARIUS.

The reply of Darius is found in Ezra 6: 6-12 and is likewise an abstract of the Persian court-documents accessible to the author of Ezra. "I Darius have made a decree" (v. 12), which decree was of course recorded in the national chronicles and transmitted to the governors of the provinces, thus becoming available for future reference. That only the substance of the decree is reproduced here is evident from the omission of the date and the usual salutation; in the course of the transmission of the firman to the author of Ezra, other omissions may have occurred; but apart from minor changes the document has every mark of genuineness.

XXXVII. LETTER OF ARTAXERXES TO EZRA.

Ezra 7: 12-26 contains the letter of Artaxerxes to Ezra authorizing him to undertake reforms in Judea. Was such a letter issued, and have we a correct copy? The narrative states explicitly that it is "the copy of the letter that the king Artaxerxes gave unto Ezra the priest," v. 11. The fact that the section 6: 19 to 7: 11, is in Hebrew and that the Aramaic is resumed in 7: 12 and continued to the end of the letter, is a proof that the letter is a transcript or at least a condensation from an authentic source. Here again divergent views are entertained. "It is difficult to consider seriously the claim that this decree was ever issued" (H. P. Smith, O. T. Hist., p. 392). Similarly Kusters: "Das Empfeh-

lungaschreiben des Arthasaatha ist so juedisch gefaerbt, dass Ezra es nicht mitgetheilt haben kann" (p. 95). On the other hand, Van Hoonacker, Meyer, Sellin, Driver and Stade regard the decree as in substance undoubtedly genuine, the latter declaring that it bears internally "den Stempel der Wahrheit" (Gesch., II., p. 153).

XXXVIII. THE BOOK OF THE CHRONICLES OF THE LEVITES.

This is the title of another genealogical table (Neh. 12: 23) prepared for future reference. It is clearly not our Chronicles, for no such matter is found there. The book here referred to must have been an official document, begun at an early period and carried down to the close of the fifth century, B. C. Various other lists, depending on lost sources, are: The genealogy of those returning with Ezra, Ezra 8: 1-14; those marrying foreign wives, Ezra 10: 18-44; those that sealed with Nehemiah, Neh. 1-31; priestly families living in Jerusalem, Neh. 11: 3-24.

XXXIX. THE BOOK OF THE RECORDS OF THE CHRONICLES.

The second chapter of Esther describing how Mordecai had saved the life of the king Ahasuerus ends with the words: "and it was written in the book of the chronicles before the king" (2: 23). Subsequently, after the erection of the gallows, "could not the king sleep; and he commanded to bring the book of records of the chronicles, and they read before him" (6: 1). The reference obviously, is to the book in which, according to 2: 23, the service of Mordecai was recorded. The king caused the annals to be read, not to learn the history of the Jews, but for his own entertainment. On any but a providential view, it is inexplicable, that just the part relating to Mordecai should be read. In Esther 10: 2, "the book of the chronicles of the king of Media and Persia," probably the same as the preceding, is cited. The mention of these books in this incidental way, is a further proof that

the custom prevailed at the Persian court in the fifth century B. C. to record even to the minutest details all the events pertaining to a reign.

XI. SUMMARY OF RESULTS.

A. *The Lost Prophetical Sources.*—It is clear from the preceding analysis, that the Hebrew prophets were the authors of a large number of works subsequently incorporated in part in the canonical scriptures, but no longer extant. Starting with the account of the reign of Solomon, we find that the Chronicler evidently drew from the same general source as the author of Kings. But the former, 2 C. 9: 29, cites as his authority for further information, not our Kings, but "the history of Nathan the prophet, the prophecy of Ahijah the Shilonite and the vision of Iddo the seer." This signifies that "the book of the Acts of Solomon," was compiled from the three prophetic writings and came gradually to be known under the collective title. The same conclusion is reached in regard to another source referred to in our Kings, "The Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah." For the events of the reign of Rehoboam, the Chronicler cites 2 C. 12: 15, "the histories of Shemaiah the prophet and of Iddo the seer," for additional matter. But since the narrative in Chronicles is practically the same as that in our Kings, which is based on "the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah," we must conclude that the ultimate authorities were the above prophetical memoirs.

In the case of other kings, of whom accounts are found in our Kings and Chronicles, earlier prophetical writings are adduced as the original authorities. It is surprising to what an extent the prophets wrote histories of the different reigns. Of the above books, numbers III., IV., V., VII., VIII., IX., XI.-XVIII., XXV., are titles of different works specifically mentioned as having been written by prophets or seers. These fifteen books could not have been the only ones originating in the prophetic guilds; they are of sufficient number and im-

portance to indicate that the data in the historical books were drawn from authentic sources and records.

B. Chronological Sequence.—(1) It is clear that early prose narratives and poetical collections, as the Book of the Wars of Jehovah, and the Book of Jashar, were reduced to writing in the period of the Judges. (2) Other collections, as the History of Samuel the Seer, of Nathan the Prophet, of Gad the Seer, the Chronicles of King David, the Book of the Acts of Solomon, the History of Shemaiah the Prophet, originated in the Davidic and Solomonic periods. (3) The Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah, and of Israel, the Prophecy of Ahijah, the Visions of Iddo, the History of Jehu, the Acts of Uzziah, the Vision of Isaiah, were composed under the early kings. (4) The Commentary of the Book of Kings, the History of Hozai, the Lamentations, the later parts of the Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah, the Acts of the Kings of Israel, were prepared toward the close of the monarchy. (5) In the latest historical books, Ezra and Nehemiah, the specific mention of books and records no longer extant shows that the authors had abundant sources at command, guaranteeing an authentic narrative. In our canonical books of the middle period, as Samuel and Kings, the reference to special books is less frequent; and least of all in the earliest books. From this it may be inferred that the sources were less numerous or less available; but also that the author did not deem it necessary constantly to cite his channels of information. That books and records are actually mentioned as extant and accessible to the public, even in the earliest period, implies the existence of others.

C. Authentic Sources.—It is clear that a large body of Hebrew literature, antedating in some cases the canonical scriptures, has perished. That the Old Testament alone has survived is a marvellous proof of its inspired character. "From the citations we may conclude that the authors of the historical books of the Old Testament had access to earlier histories and other writings, which they used as sources.

Thereby the historical trustworthiness is assured; for the authors of our books could not in general have been eyewitnesses of the facts recorded" (Bleek-Wellhausen, *Einleitung* 6te Auflage, S. 16). The Book of Judges covers a period of about 400 years, Samuel at least 100, and Kings 450; and the Pentateuch the whole period from the creation to the death of Moses. If, however, the authors of these works had access to records written contemporaneously with, or shortly after, the events, their narratives attain a high degree of credibility. From the preceding account of upwards of thirty books mentioned in nearly a hundred passages, we must infer that these somewhat incidental references to special sources imply a still greater body of literature and of national records, from which the writers drew, and which they could have cited, if occasion demanded.²⁸

²⁸ In addition to the works discussed in the text, some writers claim that other lost books are mentioned in the Old Testament, as: Amalek's Defeat, Ex. 17: 14; the Book of the Constitution of the Kingdom, 1 Sam. 10: 25; Solomon's Thousand and Five Songs, 1 K. 4: 32 (Hebrew 5: 12); Solomon's Works on Natural History, 1 K. 4: 33; the Ancient Records, 1 C. 4: 22; and the Book of Jehovah, Isaiah 34: 16. The proof seems inadequate.

The Book of the Covenant.—In Ex. 24: 7, we read that "Moses took the book of the covenant and read in the audience of the people." As this "book" is understood by critics of every shade to refer to the preceding legislation, it does not fall within the scope of our subject. See W. H. Green, *The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch*, p. 36. C. A. Briggs, *The Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch*, p. 210.

The Book of the Law.—2 K. 22: 8-20 contains an account of the finding of "the Book of the Law" in the time of Josiah. See 2 C. 34: 14, where it is called "The Book of the Law of Jehovah, Given by Moses." Whether this book was the whole Pentateuch, or only a part of it, as the Book of Deuteronomy, and when, under either view, it was composed, are some of the crucial questions of the Pentateuchal controversy and cannot receive consideration here.

TIFFIN, OHIO.

II.

ARTHUR CHRISTOPHER BENSON: HIS REMARKABLE CONFESSION OF FAITH.

BY PROF. JOHN C. BOWMAN, D.D.

The name and growing fame of Mr. Benson are a sufficient warrant for his recognition in the REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW. The reader of current literature must have observed the frequent laudatory references to his several books which have secured wide popularity in England, and which are now eliciting high appreciation in this country.

My first acquaintance with Mr. Benson began a few years ago, while recreating in the field of periodical literature. I happened upon a series of anonymous articles in an English magazine, under the title, *From a College Window*. The essays were replete with rich, elevating thought, couched in language so pure and gentle as to remind one of the literary masters, Addison and Lamb; differing in this, that the thoughtful meditations were given in a more familiar tone, and were better suited to the needs of our own time. At the same time I found in the essays a lofty idealism and an introspective tendency which reminded one of Amiel's *Journal Intime*, but leaving an impression far more agreeable and helpful. What impressed me as the peculiar charm of the observations *From a College Window*, was the spell of a strong, pure, refined personality, whose pervasive influence intoned every sentence penned by the author. Later on, from various sources came the more or less interesting information that the author is "the son of the late Archbishop Benson; for some years Master at Eton, and at the present time a fellow of Magdalene College, Cambridge; a writer of not less than sixteen volumes."

It is not my purpose in the present article to give Review Notices of Mr. Benson's several books, but rather to direct attention to the religious element in the character of the distinguished author, as this so fully appears in the book recently issued by his American publishers, bearing the title: *The Thread of Gold*.¹ It may be well, however, to make brief notice of the general characteristics of Mr. Benson's writings, as a preface to the consideration of what may be regarded as the dominant trait in the author's character and works: that is, a profoundly reverent and religious spirit.

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS.

Mr. Benson has been styled "an apostle of the meditative life." As yet he has not entered the list—legion—of sociologists, political economists and finance-doctors, who are contributing so volubly and voluminously to the turmoil of the social and industrial world. He does not hold himself aloof from these busy concerns of life, as things apart from his academic environment and unsuited to his scholarly taste, but he deals with other problems not less important, and, from his point of view, far more important. These are the deeper problems of life: the human soul, individual character, religion. He would have man meditate on things true, honorable, just, pure, lovely, things of good report; and by the habit of meditation on these things lighten the burden of life's cares and enrich life's joy. He would bring peace, restfulness, contentment, hope and joy into the lives of men who are too absorbingly engrossed in the pursuit and possession of the delusive riches of a noisy, bustling, materialistic age. This he does, not as a cynic and an iconoclast, but by leading the reader into paths of life and realms of thought where things most valuable and beautiful may be found.

Mr. Benson is both mystical and strongly intuitional, and is much given to the contemplative mood; but he is no recluse. He loves human companionship and keeps in close touch with

¹ E. P. Dutton & Co., New York, 1907.

the scenes of everyday life. At times he draws from the realm of beauty and art material for pleasurable reflection; but more frequently does he find lessons for thought and life in his every-day experiences and observations. The commonest things and incidents of life are uplifted by his poetic touch. In the book already referred to, *The Thread of Gold*, we find that even farm-yard scenes are not beneath the dignity of his thought and pen. He describes "the little dramas of the byre"—the habits of cows and pigs, the ludicrous capers of turkeys, ducks, cocks and hens—without descending to the commonplace. His classical taste and refined culture remain unimpaired. He has a breadth of sympathy which enables him to share in the joy of life experienced by the young husband and wife in the first flush of married happiness, while his heart is keenly sensitive to the cares of the world-worn, the frailties of the aged and feeble, the deprivations of the blind, the sufferings of the invalid, the pathetic disabilities of the insane. So tender is his sympathy for every creature whose life yields to impairment or is subject to neglect, that he feels "a great hunger of heart, a vivid pity," impelling him to render help for its renewal and preservation. He feels this "sad desire," not only when he sees some well-loved friend under the shadow of death, but when he looks upon "a wounded animal," or upon "the flower that has stood on one's table and cheered the air with its freshness and fragrance, when it begins to droop and to grow stained and sordid."

As to Mr. Benson's style, its peculiarity consists not primarily in its simplicity, directness and purity, but in a very unusual egotism: an egotism not out of harmony with the spirit of humility and self-respecting reserve. Mr. Benson has much to say of himself, his thought, his feeling, his consciousness, his aspirations, his experiences; but he does this not in the spirit of hauteur, or self-esteem, but as one seeking higher attainment in the things which he describes and exalts. He opens his mind and heart to you in the confidence of trustful friendship and companionship. He is to the reader

what, according to Mr. Benson, Wordsworth, with all his merits as a poet, failed to be—"a brother and a friend, a leader and a guide—a comrade." The peculiar charm of our author is a kind, genial, helpful personality, that does not find its measure in any or all of the works he has written. After reading his books you think not so much of what he has written as of him. You feel that you have been in the company of a man of pure and elevated mind, of one who casts around you an atmosphere of refined, mental and spiritual culture. He has talked with you, and you know him.

Mr. Benson is an essayist. His works give most convincing proof that the day of the essay and the essayist has not passed away. Short stories and historical novels, which too vauntingly have been crowding the field of popular literature, leave wide room *at the front* for Mr. Benson, the essayist. The stories which he tells—and he tells many of them with all the charm of the writer of fiction—are not for the moment's entertainment; they are studies, full of vigorous thought, which incite and stimulate thoughtful reflection. Not only by the attractiveness of his style does he win and please the reader, but he uplifts, dignifies, and enriches literature with the staying qualities of thought-content.

THE RELIGIOUS ELEMENT.

It is this above all else that dominates the character and writings of Mr. Benson. And, perhaps, this is the secret of the strong, elevating, restful influence which he exerts upon the minds of his hearers; an influence which has won for him "a sort of primacy among present English writers." The religious note sounds through the entire volume of *The Thread of Gold*. His purpose, as indicated in the Preface, is to commend and exalt the "Gospel of Contentment"—a contentment which shall not be unsettled by the perplexing metaphysical questions about the "Why and the Wherefore and the What." The *motif* of the book is that, "whether

we are conquerors or conquered, triumphant or despairing, prosperous or pitiful, well or ailing, we are all these things through Him that loves us." How closely akin is this to the definition of the Providence of God as given in answer to Question XXVII. in the Heidelberg Catechism: "The Almighty and everywhere present power of God; whereby, as it were by His Hand, He upholds and governs heaven and earth, and all creatures; so that herbs and grass, rain and drought, fruitful and barren years, meat and drink, health and sickness, riches and poverty, yea all things come not by chance, but by His fatherly hand." To the thought of Mr. Benson, the divine purpose vitalizes and illumines the whole world of nature. The sparkling water drop has its own definite place in the mind of God as well as in the economy of the world. At no time in its appointed course, even when polluted in the turbid elements of scum and mud and slime, is it robbed of "the light and warmth of the great, kindly, smiling Heart which bade it be." The analogy of the water drop, in its original and ultimate relation to God and to the world, suggests the more precious value and the higher destiny of the immortal soul of man. "Shall he not much more care for you, O ye of little faith?"

Mr. Benson steers serenely between the Scylla of the false philosophy of fatalism and the Charybdis of the no less false theology of predestination. He does not attempt to explain, or to explain away, the hard problems of nature and religion, of philosophy and theology; nor does he seek refuge in unthinking obscurantism or faithless agnosticism. "The Riddle of the Universe," which offers no solution to the scientific mind of Haeckel and his followers, is no cause for distress or discomfiture. By faith we know that in and over the universe, and underneath all its complexities, there is an all-wise and all-loving God. One may not always define what His Will is, but one may be "sure that it is high and holy, even when it is hard to discern and harder still to follow." It is not the wisest use of the darkest moment of life to seek its solution

in the court of reason; to "press the quality out of it—that is the best victory." The wisdom of God may not be questioned because we fail to discern His wisdom in the nature of the cuckoo—"the false and pretty bird." Its flute-like notes of pleasure seem not to accord with its "satanically clever instinct to search for a built nest, and to cast its foundling egg there for other birds to welcome and feed the intruder. Why was that instinct originated by the Creator, and developed and trained till it became an absolute law of the cuckoo tribe? We cannot answer." But even when confronted by such instances of inexplicable natural law, it is not wise to doubt or distrust. It is better to "keep the windows of the mind open to the light," and to rest our baffled thought in "utter trustfulness." The cuckoo is a "direct revelation of the Creator's mind"; and could we discern the meaning of what seems to be an abnormal law, we would find it to be in harmony with God's infinite wisdom and love. In our present immature state there is much that cannot now be made plain; much that is strange and complex in the tangle of our lives; but, as God's children, we need to cultivate "a certain confidence, a certain patience; then shall we be better prepared to learn what the deepest instinct of our nature bids us believe, that the Father is trying to teach us, or is at least willing that we should learn if we can."

A consciousness of God, far different from that of the "God-intoxicated Spinoza," seems to be ingrained into every fibre of Mr. Benson's thought. All nature, all things, speak of God, of "the tender Fatherhood of God." The name of God, or if not that, thoughts of God, appear on every page. As *The Thread of Gold* begins with God, so does it end with God. Most fittingly does Mr. Benson conclude his volume with a trustful child-like prayer to the Father; honoring Him as the source of all comfort and joy; pleading that he ever may be upheld and infolded safe in His arms.

These are some of the main lines of thought which run through the pages of *The Thread of Gold*, which I have freely

reproduced in my own language, here and there interspersed with direct quotations. In all this, Mr. Benson's teaching will be accepted as eminently orthodox. Let us not forget his strong, clear, unfaltering notes of christian faith and hope, as later on we follow the author along the path of dissenting belief.

As the gentle apostle of love could at times be changed into "a son of thunder," so Mr. Benson, who envelopes his readers in an atmosphere of quiet thoughtfulness and religious peace, may be aroused to intense, if not violent, indignation. His attitude toward much of the prevalent theological thought of our day is that of a strong and fearless dissenter. He strikes heavy blows at dogmatic systems of religion which profess to define with certainty the purposes of God in creation and providence. He condemns them as "weak and arrogant." Milton he assails as an arch-offender. "The sweet poems and sonnets that make the pedestal for his fame"—the inspired products of his beautiful youth—do not redeem the "grim old author of *Paradise Lost*—master of every form of ugly vituperation." The protesting spirit of Mr. Benson can best be expressed in his own language, reproduced from selected sentences from his chapter on *The Secret*. "I have read *Paradise Lost* with anger and indignation. The book has done a great deal of harm. It is responsible for a great many of the harsh, business-like, dismal views of religion, that prevail among us." The passages where God the Father discusses the situation of affairs, and arranges matters with the Saviour, "are some of the most profane and vicious passages in English literature." The scheme of Redemption, which inflicts punishment upon an innocent victim, is "stupid brutality, disguised, alas, in the solemn and magnificent robe of sonorous language." The character of God, as displayed by Milton, is that of a "commercial, complacent, irritable Puritan." The description is "wicked and abominable." "I would no more allow an intelligent child to read it than I would allow him to read an obscene book. . . . The

passage where the rebel angels cast cannon, make gunpowder, and mow the good angels down in rows, is incredibly puerile and ridiculous. The hateful materialism of the whole thing is patent. I wish that the English church could have an Index, and put *Paradise Lost* upon it, and allow no one to read it until he had reached years of discretion, and then only with a certificate, and for purely literary purposes." Thus with the critic's scourge he clears the way that leads to religion's innermost sanctuary, where the secret of truth, of life, of heaven, may be revealed. After the subsidence of the storm of indignation, Mr. Benson, with his usual tranquility, meditates mystically and reverently upon the exceeding preciousness and beauty of the "Secret" of life, of religion, of character, disclosed to those only who visit the Holiest Place. It is a secret which escapes the probings of reason; language fails to define it; it is "an intuition, a vision, a joy that can be captured, practised, retained."

Mr. Benson's best thoughts, thoughts to him most sacred and influential, come by vision, by inner revelation; they are flashed into his soul by intuition. By intuition he preferably seeks and acquires knowledge of things true and beautiful. Discoursing on the Eternal Will, he says: "The more I follow intuition rather than reason, the nearer I seem to come to the truth." Again, "Life lived with the intuition is all religion;" that is, life lived in company with "the one Guide, closer than friend, or brother or lover." His method of knowledge is directly opposite to that of the scientific analyst. He is a reactionary against the prevailing thought-method of the age. For this reason his contributions to the age may be more needful and valuable.

It is difficult to reconcile with Mr. Benson's prayerful spirit his disinclination toward the formal public services of the sanctuary; and the more so because, as a Churchman, he urges the observance of the Sacrament. He deplores the use of a ritual which "runs in a prescribed track"; and he is repelled by the externalism and formalism of public worship.

Yet, in the spirit of fairness, he would not urge as a rule what he approves as a personal preference. "I do not," he writes, "forego the practice of liturgical attendance; for a solemn service, with all the resources of musical sound and ceremonial movement, does uplift and rejoice the soul. I would not for an instant discourage those who find that liturgical usage uplifts them; but neither would I have those to be discouraged who find that it has no meaning for them. But the deeper secret lies in the fact that prayer is an attitude of soul, and not a ceremony; that it is an individual mystery and not a piece of ceremonial pomp." His feeling, or conviction, thus expressed, may be accounted for partly by the strong mystical and intuitionist elements in his character, and partly by the fact that his religious re-awakening was caused by the impression made upon him by the ministrations of Mr. Moody.

A REMARKABLE CONFESSION.

This has been purposely reserved for consideration as the concluding portion of this article, in order that it may be read and appreciated in the light of all that precedes. Mr. Benson is a liberalist. He claims "a Christian liberty of thought," which shall have accorded to it "the full freedom of rational inquiry and spiritual intuition"; as much freedom to withhold assent as to yield assent. Openly and unqualifiedly he dissents from many of the pronouncements of theologians and of the Church, which have been wrought into the fabric of definite dogma, constructed around the central truths of Christianity. "I hate," he writes, "with a deep-seated hatred, all attempts to bind and confine the rising tide of thought. I want to see religion vital and not formal, elastic and not cramped by precedent and tradition."

In his chapter on "The Faith of Christ," wherein he cites an instance of "acrimonious and irrational dogmatism" of a theologian who entrenches his fixed and certain creed behind the bulwarks of the councils of the Church, he makes earnest plea for a larger and wider faith in the following strong and

clear language: "If only the clergy could realize that what ordinary laymen like myself want is a greater elasticity instead of an irrational certainty! If only, instead of feebly trying to save the outworks, which are already in the hands of the enemy, they would man the walls of the central fortress! If only they would say plainly that a man could remain a convinced Christian, and yet not be bound to hold the literal accuracy of the account of miraculous incidents recorded in the Bible, it would be a great relief.

"I am myself in the position of thousands of other laymen. I am a sincere Christian; and yet I regard the Old Testament and the New Testament alike as the work of fallible men and of poetical minds. I regard the Old Testament as a noble collection of ancient writings, containing myths, chronicles, fables, poems, and dramas, the value of which consists in the intense faith in a personal God and Father with which it is penetrated.

"When I come to the New Testament, I feel myself, in the Gospels, confronted by the most wonderful personality which has ever drawn breath upon the earth. I am not in a position to affirm or to deny the exact truth of the miraculous occurrences there related; but the more conscious I am of the fallibility, the lack of subtlety, the absence of trained historical method that the writers display, the more convinced I am of the essential truth of the person and teachings of Christ, because he seems to me a figure so infinitely beyond the intellectual power of those who described him to have invented or created.

"If the authors of the Gospels had been men of delicate literary skill, of acute philosophical or poetical insight, like Plato or Shakespeare, then I should be far less convinced of the integral truth of the record. But the words and sayings of Christ, the ideas which he disseminated, seem to me so infinitely above the highest achievements of the human spirit, that I have no difficulty in confessing, humbly and reverently, that I am in the presence of one who seems to be above

humanity, and not only of it. If all the miraculous events of the Gospels could be proved never to have occurred, it would not disturb my faith in Christ for an instant. But I am content, as it is, to believe in the possibility of so abnormal² a personality being surrounded by abnormal events, though I am not in a position to disentangle the actual truth from the possibilities of misrepresentation and exaggeration.

"Dealing with the rest of the New Testament, I see in the Acts of the Apostles a deeply interesting record of the first ripples of the faith in the world. In the Pauline and other epistles I see the words of fervent primitive Christians, men of real and untutored genius, in which one has amazing instances of the effect produced, on contemporary or nearly contemporary persons, of the same overwhelming personality, the personality of Christ. In the Apocalypse, I see a vision of deep poetical force and insight.

"But in none of these compositions, though they reveal a glow and fervour of conviction that places them high among the memorials of the human spirit, do I recognize anything which is beyond human possibilities. I observe, indeed, that St. Paul's method of argument is not always perfectly consistent, nor his conclusions absolutely cogent. Such inspiration as they contain they draw from their nearness to and their close apprehension of the dim and awe-inspiring presence of Christ himself.

"If, as I say, the Church would concentrate her forces in this inner fortress, the personality of Christ, and quit the debatable ground of historical enquiry, it would be to me and to many an unfeigned relief; but meanwhile, neither scientific critics nor irrational pedants shall invalidate my claim to be of the number of believing christians. I claim a christian liberty of thought, while I acknowledge, with bowed head, my belief in God, the Father of men, in a Divine Christ, the Redeemer and Saviour, and in the presence in the hearts of

² The readers of this REVIEW will doubtless regard the use of the word *abnormal* in such connection as questionable.

men of a Divine spirit, leading humanity tenderly forward. I can neither affirm nor deny the literal accuracy of the Scripture records; I am not in a position to deny the superstructure of definite dogma raised by the tradition of the Church about the central truths of its teaching, but neither can I deny the possibility of an admixture of human error in the fabric. I claim my right to receive the Sacraments of my Church, believing as I do that they invigorate the soul, bring the presence of its Redemeeer near, and constitute a bond of Christian unity. But I have no reason to believe that any human pronouncement whatever, the pronouncements of men of science as well as the pronouncements of theologians, are not liable to error. There is indeed no fact in the world except the fact of my own existence of which I am absolutely certain. And thus I can accept no system of religion which is based upon deductions, however subtle, from isolated texts, because I cannot be sure of the infallibility of any form of human expression. Yet, on the other hand, I seem to discern with as much certainty as I can discern anything in this world, where all is so dark, the presence upon earth at a certain date of a personality which commands my homage and allegiance. And upon this I build my trust."

The foregoing confession of mingled assent and dissent is reproduced verbally as it appears in *The Thread of Gold*. The quotation and commendation of the deliverance in this connection do not involve the unqualified approval of every individual statement made by the author. Notwithstanding, it is reproduced as a very remarkable confession.

Mr. Benson plants himself firmly on the rock-foundations of Christianity, unwilling to sacrifice "the least portion of the essential teachings of Christ." As a churchman, he claims his right to receive the Sacraments of the Church. As a Christian, he "acknowledges with bowed head, belief in God the Father of men, in the Divine Christ, the Redeemer and Saviour, and in the presence in the hearts of men of a Divine Spirit, leading humanity tenderly forward."

Such a confession and plea as the foregoing, even though voiced by an eminent writer, and a son of an Archbishop, may be regarded as having no more value than the statement or conviction of an individual. But we have to do here with something more than an individual utterance. It is the voice of a great multitude; and this gives to it immense and commanding significance. Mr. Benson tells us that he speaks for "thousands of other laymen." These are to be found not only in Great Britain but in our own country as well.

More and more closely and persistently does the challenge press itself upon the attention and the wisdom of the Church: What attitude shall the Church assume towards those who profess unfalteringly their faith in the teaching of Jesus, in all the essential truths of the Christian religion, and who will not, and cannot, yield assent to dogmas whose vitality has long been waning, and which, in relation to the thought and life of both the ministry and the laity, are fast falling into desuetude? If we read aright the signs of the times, we may hope that the day is drawing near for a credal reconstruction and for an ecclesiastical reorganization on a basis wide enough and liberal enough to afford welcome room for all whose religion finds expression in the relative fulfilment of what must ever be regarded as the most essential requirement of religion: "to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God."

LANCASTER, PA.

III.

THE LORD OF GLORY.

BY PROF. WILLIAM C. SCHAEFFER, D.D.

Under this title Professor B. B. Warfield, of Princeton, has given us an able, an interesting, and a timely book, on a subject which just now lies at the very heart of theological discussion. It is a vigorous defense of our Lord's Deity. At a time when so much is written to emphasize the humanity of Jesus, and when the trend of so much of contemporaneous discussion is away from the old doctrine on His divinity, it is refreshing to have such a clear and forcible exposition of the New Testament teaching on the subject. Whether one agrees with the author at all points or not, he can not well help recognizing that we have here a very able contribution to a discussion, which touches the very heart of our Christian faith. What the author proposes to do is stated more definitely in the alternate title on the title page: "A Study of the Designations of Our Lord in the New Testament with Special Reference to His Deity."

Beginning with the Gospel according to St. Mark, the author goes over the entire New Testament, examining text by text the various titles that are given to our Lord, and the different terms which He uses in referring to Himself. The conclusion which he reaches is that Jesus both claimed to be on an equality with God, and that He was so recognized and acknowledged by all the New Testament writers, and by the whole of the primitive Church.

The author does well in beginning with the Second Gospel; for while it is not the oldest of our New Testament books, it is undoubtedly the oldest of our Gospels, and it represents

the oldest Christian tradition with reference to the life and work of Jesus. The various designations used throughout this Gospel are passed in review, and the significance of each is given, together with the suggestions which the peculiar circumstances, under which they are used, give. Beginning with "Jesus," "Jesus of Nazareth," the author discusses the significance of "Teacher," "Lord," "Bridegroom," and the various Messianic designations, "Jesus Christ," "Christ," "King of Israel," "Son of David," "Son of God," "The Son," and "Son of Man."

The gist of the discussion may be gathered from what is said on the last two of these designations.

Commenting on the voice from heaven, "This is my beloved Son" (1: 11; 9: 7), the author says: "The meaning is that the Son stands out among all others who can be called sons as in a unique and unapproachable sense the Son of God. Of course, it is possible to represent this as importing nothing more than that the person so designated is the Messiah, singled out to be the vicegerent of God on earth; and it is noticeable that it is as the Messiah that Jesus calls God appropriately 'His Father' when He declares that the Son of Man is to come in the glory of his Father with the holy angels (8: 38), and certainly it was in lowly subjection to the will of God that He prayed at Gethsemane, 'Abba, Father, remove this cup from me' (14: 36). But this explanation is scarcely adequate; and in any case there is intimated in this usage a closeness as well as a uniqueness of relation existing between Jesus and God, which raises Jesus far beyond comparison with any other son of man. And that remarkable passage, 13: 32, in which Jesus declares His ignorance, though He be the Son, of the day of His advent, exalts Him apparently above not men only, but angels as well, next to the Father Himself, with whom rather than with the angels He seems to be classed."¹

All the Messianic designations, mentioned above, are ascribed to Jesus by others and accepted by Him; and, though

¹ Pages 22, 23.

several of them are occasionally used by Himself, the designation, which He is represented as constantly applying to Himself, and which is also peculiar to Himself, is "The Son of Man." The origin of this title is traced to Daniel 7: 13. It is shown that Jesus used it as synonymous with "Christ" in 8: 31, where after Peter's confession that Jesus is the Christ, He began at once to teach that "the Son of Man must suffer many things." "Similarly in 13: 26 our Lord notifies us that although many 'false Christs' shall arise who may deceive men, yet when certain signs shall occur, 'then shall they see the Son of Man coming.'"² So that if we ask, "Who is this Son of Man," we must answer, shortly, "The Christ of God."

"The difficulty created by our Lord's use of this phrase seems, indeed, as represented by Mark, not so much to have lain in apprehending that it involved a claim to Messianic dignity, as in comprehending the character of the Messianic conception which He expressed by it."³ Jesus chose this title in preference to the more current Messianic designations to show that, while He claimed the Messianic dignity, He proposed to fill the conception itself with a new import. In adopting this title in preference to all others, Jesus in effect says to his contemporaries, "In the conception you are cherishing of the Messianic king, you are neglecting whole regions of prophecy, and forming most mistaken expectations regarding Him: it is from the Son of Man in Daniel rather than from the Son of David of the Psalms and Samuel that you should take your starting point."⁴

After a somewhat lengthy discussion of the various uses of the title, "Son of Man," in which the author points out how it is used to set forth the state of humiliation, and at the same time the approaching state of exaltation in which Jesus shall be the Judge of all the earth, he gives us what he

² Page 24.

³ Page 25.

⁴ Page 26.

regards as included in the designation. The title has a soteriologico-eschatological, rather than a Christological bearing. "To Mark the 'Son of Man,' as reflected in the sayings he cites from the lips of the Lord, is the divinely sent Redeemer, come to minister to men and to give His life a ransom for many, who as Redeemer brings His chosen ones to glory and, holding the destinies of men in His hands, casts out those who have rejected Him—even while yet on earth pre-adumbrating the final issue by exercising His authority over religious ordinances and the forgiveness of sin. Little is said directly of the person of this Redeemer. It is a human figure, ministering, suffering, dying—though clothed already with authority in the midst of its humility (or shall we not rather say, its humiliation?)—which moves before us in its earthly career: it is a superhuman figure which is to return, clothed in glory—'sitting at the right hand of power' and coming with the clouds of heaven (14: 62), or 'coming in the clouds with great power and glory' (13: 26)—'in the glory of His Father with the holy angels' (8: 38), those holy angels who are sent forth by Him to do His bidding, that they may gather to Him His chosen ones (13: 27). Although there are intermingled traits derived from other lines of prophecy, the reference to the great vision of Daniel 7: 13, 14 in these utterances is express and pervasive, and we cannot go astray in assuming that Jesus is represented as, in adopting the title 'Son of Man' for His constant designation of Himself, intending to identify Himself with that heavenly figure of Daniel's vision, who is described as 'like to a son of man' in contrast with the bestial figures of the preceding context, and as having committed to Him by God a universal and eternal dominion. Primarily His purpose seems to have been to represent Himself as the introducer of the Kingdom of God; and in so doing, to emphasize on the one hand the humiliation of His earthly lot as the founder of the Kingdom in His blood, and on the other the glory of His real station as exhibited in His consummation of the kingdom with power.

So conceived, this designation takes its place at the head of all the Messianic designations, and involves a conception of the Messianic function and personality alike which remove it as far as possible from that of a purely earthly monarch, administered by an earth-born king. Under this conception the Messianic person is conceived as a heavenly being, who comes to earth with a divinely given mission; His work on earth is conceived as purely spiritual and as carried out in a state of humiliation; while His glory is postponed to a future manifestation which is identified with the judgment day and the end of the world. In the figure of the 'Son of Man,' in a word, we have the spiritual and supernatural Messiah by way of eminence."⁵

We give this long extract, because it sets forth the author's position in such clear and unmistakable terms. The title, "Son of Man," perhaps more than any other, sets forth the estimate which Jesus had formed of His own person and mission.

Agreeably with this explanation of the principal one of the Messianic designations found in the Second Gospel is the definition which the author gives of Mark's conception of our Lord. An entire chapter is given to this subject. Omitting the augment, Dr. Warfield's position here may be given in a few brief quotations. "It is idle to speak of Mark presenting us in his account of Jesus with the picture of a purely human life. It belongs to the very essence of his undertaking to portray this life as supernatural; and, from beginning to end, he sets it forth as thoroughly supernatural."⁶ Again near the close of the chapter, he says, "It cannot be doubted, therefore, that Mark sees in Jesus a supernatural person, not merely a person endowed with supernatural powers, but a person in His own personality superior to angels and therefore standing outside the category of creatures."⁷ This pic-

⁵ Pages 29, 30.

⁶ Pages 32, 33.

⁷ Page 60.

ture, it is true, is one on which Mark does not especially dwell. "It emerges in his narrative, almost, we may say, by accident. This is in accordance with the character of his undertaking, which is illustrated by many kindred phenomena. His is not the Gospel of reflection: it is the Gospel of action."⁸

The author next gives a chapter to a study of the designations in the Gospel according to St. Matthew; and then another to Matthew's conception of our Lord. He prefaces the discussion with this remark, "When we turn to Matthew's Gospel, and observe the designations applied to our Lord, what chiefly strikes us is that it runs in this matter on precisely the same lines with Mark, with only this difference, that what is more or less latent in Mark becomes fully patent in Matthew."⁹

There are three passages, in which the teaching of Jesus reaches its culmination. They are 24: 36; 11: 27; and 28: 18-20. The first occurs also in Mark; the others are peculiar to Matthew. We have room only for what the author has to say on the second. "The second of the utterances in question (11: 27) is in some respects the most remarkable in the whole compass of the four Gospels. Even the Gospel of John contains nothing which penetrates more deeply into the essential relation of the Son to the Father. Indeed, as Dr. Sanday suggests, 'we might describe the teaching of the Fourth Gospel' as only 'a series of variations upon one theme, which has its classical expression' in 'this verse of the Synoptics': 'All things were delivered unto me by my Father; and no one knoweth the Son save the Father; neither doth any know the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal Him.' The point of the utterance, it will be seen, is that in it our Lord asserts for Himself a relation of practical equality with the Father, here described in most elevated terms as the 'Lord of heaven and earth' (v. 25). As the Father only can know the Son, so the Son only can know the Father: and others may know the Father

* Page 50.

* Page 57.

only as He is revealed by the Son. That is, not merely is the Son the exclusive revealer of God, but the mutual knowledge of Father and Son is put on what seems very much a par. The Son can be known only by the Father in all that He is, as if His being were infinite and as such inscrutable to the finite intelligence; and His knowledge alone—again as if He were infinite in His attributes—is competent to compass the depths of the Father's infinite being. He who holds this relation to the Father cannot conceivably be a creature, and we ought not to be surprised, therefore, to find in the third of these great utterances (28: 18-20) the Son made openly a sharer with the Father (and with the Holy Spirit) in the single name of God."¹⁰

In summing up his discussion of the first Gospel, Dr. Warfield has this to say of Matthew's conception of our Lord. "It lies on the very surface of these designations that by Matthew, as truly as by Mark, Jesus is conceived in the first instance as the promised Messiah, and His career and work as fundamentally the career and work of the Messiah, at last come to introduce the promised Kingdom. And it lies equally on their very face that this Messiah whom Jesus is represented as being is conceived by Matthew, and is represented by Matthew as having been conceived by Jesus Himself, as a 'transcendent' figure, as the current mode of speech puts it, i. e., as far transcending in His nature and dignity human conditions."¹¹ In view of what Jesus claims for Himself as the Son (11: 27), "it is no longer strange that to Him are attributed all the functions of God, including the forgiveness of sins and the universal judgment of men, nor that in Him is seen the coming of Jehovah to save His people, in His presence with men the fulfillment of the prophecy of 'Immanuel,' God-with-us, in the coming of John the Baptist to prepare His way the fulfillment of the prophecy of the messenger to make the way of Jehovah straight, and the like. All

¹⁰ Pages 81-83.

¹¹ Page 89.

things were delivered to Him, in short, because He is none else than God on earth."¹² Matthew's portrait of Jesus is just this "that Jesus is all that God is, and shares in God's nature as truly as in God's majesty and power."¹³

We have pursued the author's argument far enough. In the chapters which follow, he points out that this is the estimate in the whole of the Synoptic Gospels, in John, in Paul, and in fact, in the whole of the New Testament. The Christology of the Fourth Gospel is in reality no higher than that of the Synoptics. "It may be said that, on this showing, little is left by the Synoptists to John, in the way of ascribing essential Deity to Jesus." And in this estimate, we think, Dr. Warfield is entirely correct. It is the position which is coming to be recognized by the "advanced theologians" themselves. Thus Wilhelm von Schneten, himself a pronounced radical of the modern school in Germany, recently said, "The Jesus of the Gospels, even of the Synoptics, is not a mere man, not even the best of men, but on the whole the Christ of the traditional teaching of the Church. In this respect there is no substantial difference between John and the other Gospels; and it is incorrect to reconstruct a kind of human 'historical' Christ out of the Synoptics." "Even Professor Bousset, the author of 'Jesus,' declares that the oldest of our Gospel records, that of Mark, already depicts Jesus not only as the Messiah of the Jewish people, but also as the eternal Son of God."¹⁴

How then does it happen that there is such a marked tendency in modern theological thought away from the historic doctrine of the divinity of our Lord? How have our radical critics come to make out such a different portrait of Jesus, like that found in Bousset's "Jesus"? It is by claiming that the Jesus of the Synoptics is not the primitive Jesus, and

¹² Page 94.

¹³ Page 96.

¹⁴ *The Literary Digest*, December 7, 1907, p. 869.

that it is necessary for us to go behind the portrait as given in our Gospels, and by a process of literary and historical criticism to reconstruct the picture of Jesus as he really was.

This subject Dr. Warfield takes up in his chapter on The Jesus of the Synoptics the Primitive Jesus. It is, in our judgment, the best thing in the book, itself worth more than the price of the entire volume. We wish that all our readers might have the opportunity of studying the chapter, and that they might ponder the significance of its contention; for, in our judgment, it shows conclusively that any estimate of Jesus, that rejects his full and proper divinity, can be formed only by rejecting the only historical records in our possession. We must content ourselves here with a brief summary of the argument of the chapter, inadequate as that must of necessity be.

Assuming, what is now almost universally accepted, that our present Gospels rest upon older documents, such as those referred to in Luke 1:1, the author shows how the testimony of our present records is thus carried back of the actual date of their composition to a time very near to that of the events which they record. Then he shows that the Christology of the "primitive Mark" must, according to all the canons of rational criticism, have been substantially like that of our present Mark. He also points out how the second of the sources, usually recognized as lying back of our present Matthew and Luke, viz., the *Logia* of Matthew, contained the very highest claim to divinity which Jesus ever made, that in Matt. 11:27 and Luke 10:22, as well as others of similar import. Literary criticism has failed to shake the claim which our present Gospels put forth.

But may not historical criticism lead us to a different conception of Jesus? So it is often claimed. An effort is made to get back of the estimate, which the evangelists formed of Jesus, to the estimate which Jesus formed of Himself. The authors of our New Testament books were worshipers of Jesus; and their faith and love, it is claimed, so biased

their judgment that they have failed to give us an accurate portrait of their Master. So the effort is made to eliminate all the passages which betray such a bias, and to start from those which are supposed to be irreconcilable with such a faith. Proceeding on this assumption, Professor Schmiedel, in his article on the Gospels in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, finds but nine sayings of Jesus which he regards as thoroughly trustworthy, and on which he then attempts to reconstruct the portrait of Jesus.¹⁵ And in this method he has found

"It is probably due to Professor Schmiedel to say that, in his preface to Dr. Neuman's Jesus, he claims to have been much misunderstood and misrepresented by English and American writers. The nine passages, above referred to, he calls "the foundation pillars for a truly scientific life of Jesus." He thinks that none of them can have been invented by the worshipers of Jesus, and that they must hence represent a genuine tradition, lying back of the worshipful regard of his followers. They hence, according to his judgment, furnish incontestable evidence, which even a sceptic must accept, that there really was such a historic personage as Jesus. This established, he is ready to admit that there are many other passages which are credible. He says: "In reality, however, I distinguish three (i. e., classes of passages): first, those which are plainly incredible; secondly, those which are plainly credible; and in the third category those which occupy an intermediate position as bearing on the face of them no certain mark either of incredibility or credibility. This third group contains almost the whole of the purely religious and moral teaching of Jesus, including most of the parables; it also embraces much that is said about various journeyings of Jesus, about works of healing of the kind that are known to happen even at present, about His entry into Jerusalem, about His cleansing of the temple, about His passion and death. . . . Nay, more, I go farther and assert that of these statements all those which affirm something peculiarly great about Jesus, or put into His mouth some saying of marked significance, *must*, on the presuppositions we have made, be accepted as historical." Yet it is to be observed, his first class of passages are those which he regards as "plainly incredible." These include all those sayings of Jesus and statements about Him which Professor Schmiedel thinks may "have found their inspiration in the worshipful regard in which He was held." So that, after all, his entire attitude is open to the criticism which Dr. Warfield has made. All passages which testify to the Deity of Jesus are classed as "incredible"; and they are rejected, not because there is any evidence against their genuineness, but because they are not in accord with Professor Schmiedel's preconceived notion of what Jesus must have been. It is well that the issue, thus clearly made, should be fully understood.

numerous followers and collaborators. What shall we say of such a method? What is left us, if we adopt such a canon of criticism, and follow it to its logical conclusion?

After pointing out how the application of this method of historical criticism must result in writing all history backwards, and in representing "every historical character as the exact contrast to what each was thought to be by all who knew and esteemed him,"¹⁶ Dr. Warfield goes on to say, "Professor Schmiedel can by the utmost sharpness of inquisition find only five, which by applying more exegetical pressure he can increase to nine," passages which can be used as a foundation for an opposing portraiture of Jesus. "The groundlessness of this assault on the trustworthiness of the portrait of Jesus presented in our Synoptics may fairly be said therefore, to be matched by its resultlessness. Material cannot be gathered from our Gospels out of which a naturalistic Christ can be created. The method of criticism adopted being purely subjective, moreover, the assumed results vary endlessly. We feel a certain sympathy, therefore, with the position assumed by those writers who frankly admit that, the evangelical portraiture of Jesus being distrusted, the real Jesus is hopelessly lost to sight. Strive as we may, we are told, we cannot penetrate behind the Jesus of our first informants—the writers of the New Testament, upon whose palette had already been mingled, nevertheless, colors derived from Jewish prophecy, Rabbinic teaching, Oriental gnosis and Christian philosophy. 'All that can be determined with certainty from these writings,' it is declared, 'is that conception of Christ which was the object of faith of the early Christian communities and their teachers': the real Jesus is hopelessly hidden under the incrustations with which faith has enveloped it. Nor does there seem to be lacking a certain logical force in the reasoning of the bolder souls who drive the inference one step further and ask what need there is of assuming a real Jesus at all. The 'real Jesus' whom the

¹⁶ Page 161.

critics invent certainly was not the author of the Christianity that exists. If the Christianity that actually exists in the world can get along without the Jesus who alone would account for it, why, they argue, must there be assumed behind it a Jesus who will not account for it; of whom this only may be said—that He is a useless figure, the assumption of whom is so far from accounting for that great religious movement which we call Christianity, that it is certain that the movement did not arise in Him and did not derive its fundamental convictions from Him? Let us, then, assume, they say, that there never was any such a person as Jesus at all, and the picture drawn of Him in the evangelists is pure myth."¹⁷

But we cannot follow out the argument to the end. Dr. Warfield is, we think, entirely right in rejecting the canon of criticism under consideration. If we must reject the testimony of those who stood nearest to Jesus in time, and who learned to love and adore Him because of the grace and truth which they saw in His life, then we may well take our stand by the side of Pastor Kalthoff in denying that there ever was such a man. But with the rejection of this canon we are brought back to the position that the only Jesus, whom the world has ever known, was, as He claimed to be, divine, sharing in the nature as well as in the prerogatives of God.

We regret that we cannot give as hearty an endorsement to Dr. Warfield's method, as to his general position and argument. That, we think, has defects which detract not a little from the value of the presentation. He calls his book a *study*; it would probably be nearer the mark, if he had called it an argument. He had evidently made up his mind long before he thought of writing this book; and he seems to have sat down to his task with the temper of an advocate, who has an important cause to plead, rather than that of a calm and dispassionate student, who has a great subject to investigate.

¹⁷ Page 162.

It is to this zeal of the advocate that we must probably charge the infelicity of claiming everything in sight, and of basing the argument at more than one point on a doubtful exegesis. We do not say faulty exegesis, but doubtful. What we mean may be illustrated by a single example. Dr. Warfield quotes Rom. 9: 5 no less than eight times, and always in the form given in the text of our versions. Now, it is well known that there is another rendering suggested by the margin both of the Revised and Standard versions. While we believe, with Dr. Warfield, that the best rendering has been adopted in the text, we recognize that the rendering of the margin is possible. It is at best a question of interpretation, or, to be more accurate, of punctuation, which is entirely wanting in the oldest Mss. The same words, if punctuated one way, give us the meaning of the text; if another way, they yield the sense of the margin. Now, in our judgment, the argument is not strengthened, but weakened, by an appeal to a passage which may be so easily used to support a different conclusion. This procedure becomes more painful, when one recalls the wealth of material at the author's disposal.

His advocate's zeal has, we think, betrayed Dr. Warfield into another infelicity. He would probably tell us that he did not start out to paint a portrait of Jesus; and yet, perhaps unconsciously, a portrait emerges from his work. He has given us a portrait of the divine Christ. It is the polar opposite of that painted by Bousset in his "Jesus." Bousset has studied the human lineaments of Jesus; and he has drawn a beautiful picture of the human character of our Lord. But so absorbed is he in the humanity of Jesus that all else eludes his grasp. He sees in Jesus nothing beyond the human, great and glorious as he finds that to be. Now, while Dr. Warfield does not deny the humanity of our Lord, he so emphasizes His divinity that the reader, at least, is in constant danger of forgetting that this heavenly being is also man, like us in all things, sin only excepted. If Bousset has given us

the portrait of an Ebionitic Christ; the portrait, which emerges from Dr. Warfield's work, comes dangerously near being that of a Docetic Christ. A portrait of Jesus which shall give us, in perfect form, and in equal proportions, the glory of the transcendent Son of God, shining through the attractive loveliness, the sinless perfection, and the self-sacrificing love of the lowly Son of Man, is still a desideratum.

LANCASTER, PA.

IV.

THE SCHOOL VERSUS THE COLLEGE.

BY PROF. CHARLES H. LERCH, A.M.

Professor Münsterberg, of Harvard, in a college address, not long ago, voiced, no doubt, the convictions of many, if not of all who are engaged in instruction in the college and the university, by his expression in no mistaken terms of the positive force of the college in the community, and by attributing her failings to the unsatisfactory work done in the lower school. "I must admire," says he, "what the American college has made and makes to-day, and will make in the future out of the entering freshman in the few years until he receives his bachelor diploma. He came as a boy and goes out as a man. He came from a school where ready-made knowledge was imparted to a passive, immature mind, and when he leaves he goes out into the world for practical work or professional schooling with that senior maturity which relies on independent judgment. Secluded from the rough battle of the outer world he can pass four years of inner growth and self-development, of learning and comradeship under the influence of scholars who devote their lives with ever-young enthusiasm to all that is true and good and beautiful. Of course, I do not want to be misunderstood as seeing no fault in the American system of instruction. There are not a few wrong tones in the symphony, wrong tones which hurt the ear of the newcomer, discords to which he will never become insensible. But those fundamental errors belong rather to the school than to the college. It is enough to point to the most devastating one, the lack of mental discipline at the very beginning of intellectual growth. The school methods appeal to

the natural desires and do not train in overcoming desire; they plead instead of command; they teach one to follow the path of least resistance instead of teaching to obey. The result is a flabby inefficiency, a loose vagueness and inaccuracy, an acquaintance with a hundred things and a mastery of none."

The writer feels sure that the majority of schoolmen will not altogether agree with the Harvard professor in his criticism of the school. Loyal as most of these are to the college, they believe that her failings are in a large measure her own. Yes, some even would go so far as to attribute the lack of mental discipline of the school to the impotency of the college. College-bred men and women are the salt of the community and teach the spirit, more definitely the social spirit, of the college, to their children and to others among whom they live. Almost all the teachers in the high schools and other preparatory institutions are college-bred and bring down with them to the school the traditions of the college. The school, thus, year by year, appropriates to itself the life of the college so that most of our larger American schools are becoming more and more like miniature colleges. A student in school anticipates college life to such a degree that he often loses his interest in it by the end of freshman year. The college thus is like a city upon a hill which becomes the cynosure of all educational eyes. She sets the example and the pace and becomes the dictator, even the autocrat, of intellectual matters and policies. Is it possible, then to trace the failings of the school to the inefficiency of the college?

What is the impression that the student of the school gets from reading about the college and from the talk of her alumni? It would be strange if it did not come to him that the serious business of the college is not scholarship. He learns through these sources so little about this and so much how to evade or to compromise with it that the axe is already laid, before he is ready for college, at the very root of the tree of his earnestness. He hears, too, that the college cata-

logue must not be interpreted literally and taken too seriously. If he thinks a little for himself, he does not see how some men, whom he knows very well, managed to get a diploma. He can not help but be impressed with the fact that the heroes of the gridiron and the diamond receive greater recognition from some of the faculty and the alumni than those who bring honor to their Alma Mater through sound scholarship. To his mind, evidently, the getting of wisdom, of knowledge, is not the chief thing of the college.

In the light of this view of the college is it not rather a difficult task for the teacher of the school, who has high ideals, to preach scholarship? If he is in favor of moderate athletics, athletics which are a means to an end, not an end in themselves, he will not be always popular and successful with his doctrine of self-restraint. Football, baseball and other features of athletics must be pursued with the same degree of attention and enthusiasm as in college, and the school has caught the fire of the college in this respect. The college sends its missionaries into the schools to proclaim the gospel of athleticism and her emissaries to cull out baseball and football material. Thus the college imparts one phase of her life to the school, but not that which ministers against "flabby inefficiency" or "loose vagueness" of scholarly training.

How about the social life of the college? How does that impress the school? Do the conduct, personal appearance, culture of the student body incite a love for high ideals in the school? Does the fraternal or unfraternal life create a stimulus in the school towards that democratic, truly American way of looking at things which it is the pride and glory of the school to teach? Is not this ugly fraternal life, after the fashion of the college, fixing its tendrils into the students below so that school boards can hardly dislodge it? The preparatory student is frequently almost wholly influenced in his choice of a college by the inducements of her fraternity life. The non-fraternity colleges must needs soon get into

the fraternity line in order that they may also put in strong bids for freshmen.

The college is the example of the school in scholarship. What is the dynamic which energizes into activity the mind of the average college student? Is it "the true and good and beautiful" of the Harvard professor? Remove the pressure of honors, prizes, grades, conditions and how much incentive to hard work is left? With these, the general average of the gerund-grinding business is low. Where there is genuine scholarship there is usually specializing, and specializing according to Professor Münsterberg is not the sphere of the college. The Harvard professor in relating the fecundating experience of his own life simply pictures the condition of the average student in college. He says that "when in the middle of his philosophical studies he came to psychology, the lightning struck." Many a youth in college suffers from a similar stroke before he gets to the middle of his subject and refuses absolutely to be interested in anything outside of his favorite specialty. The average college student turns his back on the culture studies or those which make for high-mindedness and character and applies his understanding almost wholly to the specialty for life. Through this narrow and narrowing mental process he gradually loses his will-power for general application and in many instances in his senior year he discovers that he is less of a student than when a freshman. The vagaries of college life have a tendency to lead to mental dissipation, and a certain high authority in a medical school had this, no doubt, in mind, when he said, I would rather have my medical students fresh from the school than from the college.

How about methods of instruction in school and college? Are not the teachers in the high and preparatory schools graduates of the colleges, often postgraduates of the universities? Have they not learned their trade at these institutions? One can scarcely teach in the live schools of to-day unless he has learned and is still learning his lessons in pedagogics or

the subjects which he teaches in the college and the university. Whole armies of teachers in our schools in the neighborhood of our large universities are constantly in touch with university chairs. These teachers bring to their schools methods of instruction which they learn at the feet of masters in colleges and universities. If they make mistakes could not the fundamental errors be traced to their sources?

We doubt whether the professors in college, as a rule, are more instinct with the spirit of truth, more enthusiastic than the teachers in the schools. Doctor Münsterberg gives two views of the college professor which do not seem to us to be complimentary. In his college address, the professor devotes his life "with ever young enthusiasm to all that is true and good and beautiful." In his "traits" "the young instructor in college has to devote himself to the widest fields, where it is impossible to aim at anything, but the most superficial acquaintance." "A good man goes into a good college. He finds an abundance of work, which crushes by its quantity his good will to go on with scholarly interests. He begins by postponing his scientific work to the next year, and the year after next. But after postponing it for a few years more his will becomes lame, his power rusty, his interest faded." What then? Is he likely to be a teacher in a college faculty who denotes his life with *ever-young enthusiasm* to all that is "true and good and beautiful"?

If the student of the school is acquainted with a hundred things and is master of none that is because the college has required them of him. There is no end to the demands of the college upon the school. The serious question with those who are acquainted with school life is, how much more pressure can be safely imposed upon the earnest, hard-working pupil? Also what new requirement will be listed next in the catalogue of the college? The schools protest loudly and long against the unreasonable imposition, but they are not heeded. Preparatory teachers would only be too glad, if they were permitted, to substitute teaching for cramming. The school

would certainly enjoy her freedom and liberty, if she were allowed to do some work in her own way.

It is not superlatively true that the freshman who ripens by and by into senior maturity had his talents wrapped in a napkin when he entered the threshold of the college. If he had, he certainly did not experience any unfolding or a new birth during his first or perhaps second year. The step from the school, away from competent experienced teachers, to cheap college tutors is not always one up, but often down. As a rule, the man who graduates with senior maturity was not altogether a novice in the art of original thinking at the beginning of his college course. The schools do once in a while manage to land a freshman who is abundantly able to take care of himself. If he could not, we are not sure who would protect him. Inner growth does not graft very well on excrescent accretion. The freshman is father of the senior and it would be well if all his college days would be bound each to each by that unsophisticated piety inspired by the things good, beautiful and true which he carried with him up from the school.

EASTON, PA.

V.

ERNST HAECKEL AND FRIEDRICH NIETZSCHE. SECOND PART.

BY PROF. R. C. SCHIEDT, PH.D.

I.

Haeckel and Nietzsche are among moderners the most formidable critics of dogmatic Christianity. They are extreme opposites both in intellectual inclination and in temperament. The one is preëminently empiricist, emphasizing the phenomenal, the other preëminently metaphysician, upholding the noumenal. The one relentlessly scientific, the other bitterly opposed to science, a philosopher and poet. Both have written most beautifully about Jesus, but they also have emphatically refuted His teachings of God. Haeckel endorses the rules of conduct as expressed in the sermon on the mount, but repudiates faith in a personal God by preaching the infallibility of the reign of the law of substance, Nietzsche severely condemns the ethics of the sermon on the mount and proclaims the ethics of the superman. Both start in Darwinism, the one finding all the problems of life solved in the evolutionary history of substance from molecule to man, the other starting with man and asking "why should man be the ebbtide in this current?" They both sum up an epoch as the most stimulating writers of the age. Haeckel is still with us, hale and hearty and ever ready to champion his cause, Nietzsche's over-sensitive constitution succumbed well nigh twenty years ago to the intense activity of an overwrought mind, he died in 1900 at the early age of fifty-six at Weimar, the Athens of his beloved Thuringian land.

II.

The idea of the superman does, indeed, rest upon Darwinian foundations, but Nietzsche's methods were not those of modern science, he never inquires into origins or generalizes on organic relationships. On the contrary he attacks the modern consciousness in its most essential phases by placing his own ideals over against the ideals of the age. But even in this antagonism he reveals his own most modern soul, reflecting all its passions and expressing all its moods in his writings. Their very form, aphoristic in style, appears like the symbol of the haste and unrest of our age. However, he is uniquely himself, analyzing life apart from all traditional views and accepted standards of judgment, but the weapons for his warfare are furnished by the age itself: by the atheism of Schopenhauer, the evolution of Darwin and the philosophy of positivism.¹

Friedrich Nietzsche, the son of an evangelical pastor, was a typical German, the true child of the German parish home, the heir of many generations of ideal types of Protestant clergymen. To them he owed beside his extraordinary mental endowment a moral rectitude and purity of soul which placed him far beyond the all-conquering sensuality of the average man. His love for truth and truthfulness was so passionate that he would not tolerate even the slightest prevarication. Together with a sublime capacity for abstract thinking and profound philosophical penetration he possessed artistic talents which gave him in his early youth a harmony of vision and beauty of expression, suffusing all his endowments with a dazzling light, and had he enjoyed in like measure an appreciation for mathematical thinking and the methods of exact science he would have been the most perfectly balanced exponent of his nation.

¹ Friedrich Nietzsche's Werke, Leipzig, T. G. Naumann: Die Geburt der Tragödie; Unzeitgemässe Betrachtungen; Menschliches, Allzumenschliches (2 vols.); Morgenröthe; Also sprach Zarathustra; Jenseits von Gut und Böse; Zur Genealogie der Moral; Der Fall Wagner, Götzen-Dämmerung; Nietzsche contra Wagner; Antichrist; Dichtungen.

With a master training in the historico-philological branches which opened to him, especially the classic treasures of Hellas, he stepped from the school into the world. Accidentally he became acquainted with Schopenhauer's works. Shortly after he had left the university of Bonn he read "*Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung*" and for years afterwards Schopenhauer's influence was strong upon him. Chopin and Schumann wrought in his view in music in the same direction with the great philosopher, seeming to him deliverers of German music from heaviness and dullness. Accidentally in 1868 he met Wagner personally after having heard the overture of the "*Meistersinger*." He was at once carried away by both music and master, and acquaintance ripened into close friendship. While professor of classical philology at Basel whither he had been called while still a student he spent many a happy hour in Tribschen, near Lucern, at the hospitable house of Richard Wagner and Frau Cosima. But this happiness lasted but a brief span of time, followed by years of loneliness and bitter struggle. Nietzsche saw in Wagner the champion of a new culture to which he himself was eager to devote his whole strength and time. In his maiden effort in book-making "*Die Geburt der Tragödie aus dem Geiste der Musik*," tragedy the child of the spirit of music, the young professor announced his life problem with all the intense fire and passion of his genius, and four brochures immediately following under the title of "*Unzeitgemässe Betrachtungen*," untimely reflections, revealed this new star in all its splendor to his attentive age.

The starting point of Nietzsche's philosophy is as with Schopenhauer the will-energy, "the will to play out the game of life fitly and fully." The deepest of all the problems, the problem of being, Nietzsche does not touch. He at once tackles the ultimate of all problems, the ethical problem, which to him is the will to live and from it he deduces not the pessimism of Schopenhauer but optimism. This is no doubt due to his innate temperament, which was the very

reverse of that of Schopenhauer. The latter was a disagreeable misanthrope, the former a gentle, tenderhearted, sensitive, artistic soul. He does not see terrible annihilation at the end of life, but he beholds the goal of life through the vista of the delights and joys of this world. In his earliest work on the origin of music and the drama he gives us his famous doctrine of what has been called the dithyrambic theory of life. His conception of primitive Hellenic culture shows that culture to be very different from the culture of the later Greek age, "that sedate, unemotional, correct and coldly aesthetic and literary culture that we now speak of as Greek and classical." This apparently mere philological treatise evolves into a philosophy which touches and embraces almost all the destinies of our race.

He declares the beautiful, the good and the true to be the three rays of light which point to primitive human nature the way out of animalism. But the common source of these rays is the metaphysical essence which is eternal and forbids inquiry. Here lies the keynote to Nietzsche's character and work. He is preëminently metaphysician, beyond the beautiful lies the metaphysical and the metaphysician in him absorbs the artist. Schopenhauer defines music as being distinct and different from all other categories of art, as independent of individual limitation, as the only medium which reveals the absolute. Wagner likewise says in his "Beethoven," that music cannot be measured by the categories of the beautiful, that its mission is not to arouse pleasure in beautiful forms. Nietzsche declares that this conception of music opens up the innermost recesses of the Greek problem. But since, to Schopenhauer, the absolute and the will are identical, he confounds the metaphysical antitheses of contents and form. Nietzsche shows himself the better philosopher by applying the definition to a concrete test and showing in his discourse on the Appollonian and Dionysiac impulses in Greek character, that, while music is to him more than melody, a world symbolism triumphant over language it is after all subordinate

to the more comprehensive idea of aesthetics and the beautiful in general. This shows the true metaphysician who distinguishes between the whole and its parts, between form and contents. "The existence of the world," he says, "is only justified as an æsthetic phenomenon." Henceforth he identifies æsthetics and metaphysics. Art is to him "the brightest problem and the real metaphysical activity of his life; art, not morality, is the only real metaphysical activity of man. Art is the metaphysical supplement to nature. Poetry strives to be the unvarnished expression of truth, and casts away the lying mask of our everyday life: there is your distinction between the absolute and the phenomenal." We now understand how his early training and inclination as well as his contact with two great minds of his age determine his subsequent position towards existing forms of religious thought, just as in the case of Haeckel the love of nature and the message of Darwin were decisive in the same way.

However, Nietzsche carves his own path. The Greek problem had become uppermost in his mind. The contrasts between the Dionysiac and Appollonian impulses are his own startling discovery horrifying his learned friends and electrifying the advanced thinkers of Germany. In primitive human nature he sees two impulses or inspirations which lead to art production, that is to movements beyond eating and sensual pleasures. The one leads through dreams, that awaken the formative, creative and coördinative faculties and turn man into a new being. Forthwith primitive man believes himself to be the favorite of a god—perchance of the god of poetry and eloquence, of song and music, of Phoebus-Apollo himself. The man awakened starts out to put into concrete form what he has seen in his dreams, to compose an epic or produce the music he has heard in his dreams on his lyre. This, in Nietzsche's words, is the Appollonian impulse. God and the poet are the only creators. This impulse is therefore only for the few. There is, however, another art-impulse which applies to the many. This is the Dionysiac

impulse. The term is derived from Dionysus, the god of the vital forces of nature, the god who presides over the germinating seeds, the budding trees and all the productive and reproductive mysteries of nature. Dionysus is to Nietzsche what he was to the early Greeks, the god who fills men's hearts with gladness when they are in touch with the exuberant powers of nature, the intoxicating effect of wine. Nietzsche for the first time showed that under these two influences the Apollonian or creative and the Dionysiac, or enjoying and receptive impulse there arose in early Hellas song, epic, poetry, the drama and the audience fit and eager to listen to the poet and dramatist.

While Schopenhauer only sees misery in life and refuses to drink the cup of life because of the cup of bitterness, Nietzsche finds in this very Apollonian and Dionysiac doctrine of art the means to baffle the evil fate which hangs over mankind. Apollo's art can reconstruct the phenomena of life more beautiful and more powerful, in presentment at least, than real life itself. Who has not felt again and again that art can gather the witchery of mountain and valley, of sea and land and sky, of war and love and by its own intrinsic charm make them transcendently more beautiful and powerful than reality itself. Now we understand what Nietzsche means when he says: "the existence of the world is only justified as an æsthetic phenomenon." The doctrine of the will to live becomes the doctrine of the will to enjoy life. "Immensely great" he says, is the difference between the early Greeks and the barbarians, because they so splendidly maintained the equilibrium between the Dionysiac-Apollonian impulses. "But why," he asks, "did the degenerate so soon?"

When the Dionysiac impulse disappeared they commenced to degenerate and the Apollonian impulse gained the preponderance, the theoretical man arose: Socrates—a form of existence hitherto impossible, satisfied with the cast-off cover of truth, while truth itself has vanished, a monstrosity in its defect of mystical qualities, which are displaced by the jug-

glery of logic. As the forerunner of a new culture, he repudiates what is Greek in essence by emphasizing one-sidedly knowledge as the only possession worthy the name. "Only he who knows," he says, "is virtuous," and points his method of thought by the famous declaration: "I know that I know nothing, others are only guided to right living by instinct." To separate knowledge from error is to him the noblest calling, scientific knowledge far surpasses the artistic. "Thus Socrates has become the vertex of the world's history."

This explanation of the hitherto unexplained retrogression of Greek culture takes Nietzsche back to his own task of working out a new culture problem. "A change has again taken place; the theoretical man is afraid of himself. Socratic culture is threatened from two sides, by German philosophy and German music, both of which have their origin in Dionysiac sources. The former has conquered the Socratic self-contentment of existence. Both Kant and Schopenhauer full well understood how to use the tools of science in order to demonstrate the limitations of knowledge, that is, to refute the claims of science to universal authority, and to triumph over the Socratic optimism which lies at the bottom of our culture and at the same time to introduce a new and profounder consideration of our ethical and æsthetic problems. Their philosophy is Dionysiac wisdom expressed in exact terms and through them we find our way back again to the tragic age represented by the Greeks, it is a return from the servitude of form to self, a home-coming to the primal source, and the Greeks have to be our teachers. Our own classic writers have been unable to open the magic mountain for us; what other hope then remains for us epigones except the mystic sound of the reawakened tragic music! Nothing else is here! The poet of words with his indirect method can do nothing alone, music must furnish the words' fundament and birthplace. For it alone is the world's specific and real idea, speaking from the heart of the world to which no bridge leads from the sphere of the phenomenal. It is then only that the

search for knowledge seems to penetrate the innermost essence of things as though the surgings of the will would become visible to our senses. The power of tragic myth shows the world of phenomena its limitations, and forces it to surrender and take refuge in the sphere of the real. The æsthetic experts know nothing of this fraternal compact of the two deities; they only moralize. In the realm of the classic myth experiences and events are only seen *sub specie æterni*, as not belonging to time, and only the stamp of the eternal constitutes the value of man and state; such a process desecularizes, demonstrates the relativity of time and points the true, i. e., the metaphysical significance of life. Compared with this conception the historical conception only means inquiry *sub specie sæculi*, and its symptoms, viz., the thirst for knowledge, the passion for new discoveries, secularization and state of decay in which we now live. We hope that beneath this convulsion of culture, this Socraticism there may be hidden an inwardly healthy primal force, an abyss such as poured forth the reformation."

It is evident Nietzsche seeks to establish the broadest metaphysical basis for his æsthetic regeneration of humanity, and we ask, what then is his attitude towards the other two rays which radiate from the metaphysical source?

The Greeks had built their culture upon two elements contained in their triple motto: *καλοκἀληθεσκάγαθόν*. They sought and saw in the beautiful the true which they held to be the foundation of the good. Nietzsche advances totally new ideas touching the last proposition. His first book leaves no doubt on that point. It resembles a covered battery brought into action years later, when he wrote his preface in 1886. Life is to him essentially non-moral, and he vehemently attacks all attempts of its moral interpretation. "Morality is the principle of decay, the secret will to annihilation, the beginning of the end. Art, not morality, is the real metaphysical activity of man, morality belongs to the sphere of the phenomenal, the realm of unrealities and deceptions, it

is illusion, error, artificial manipulation." It is above all Christian morality which offers the sharpest contrast to his æsthetic world interpretation. "My instinct turned against this danger of all dangers, as the defender of life and I invented a doctrine principally the opposite."

Nietzsche's deepest instincts, the impulses which indefatigably drive him again and again into the struggle are indeed of an ethical nature. Even his aversion towards "science" in its broadest sense as the acme of infallibility, only grows out of his love for truth which shrinks from a compromise with a premature assumption that knowledge has reached its goal. We see him standing alone on the heights of humanity besieged by the hosts of traditional standards. Does he despise knowledge and reason, when he scornfully asks: "Why and whence is scientific knowledge?" Shall we answer him with Mephistopheles? Is it refuge from pessimism, a delicate self-defense against truth? Is it then cowardice, hypocrisy, trickery, when he seeks a solution of the problem of scientific knowledge, which can not be solved on a scientific basis, from the standpoint of art and by means of the optics of an artist? When he as the attorney of truth chastizes the conceit which carries causality to the very depth of being: "Science hastens precipitously to its limitations, gazing into the realm of the inexplicable; logic coils around itself and bites its own tail." But are we not agreed that science claims to be merely a method of searching after the truth, that truth in its broadest sense is impossible outside of scientific knowledge and that we cannot know truth except as we take refuge in science? Perhaps after all those are best off whose mother tongue is *not* music?

We feel at once how utterly Nietzsche disagrees with Haeckel. The task of his life henceforward, is to lead humanity out of this labyrinth of difficulties. Neither personal glory nor selfish gain ever enter the consideration of his genius, there is a halo of utter unselfishness around his personality, but it is ultimately the unselfishness of con-

descending conscious power which neither recognizes a superior power nor brooks contradiction. He had finally found the way to himself which leads him farther and farther away from his contemporaries along constantly steeper paths, until he reaches the most desolate peak—aside of the deep abyss.

He analyzes the character of genius and writes in 1875 and 1876 his four famous brochures on "*Unzeitgemässe Betrachtungen*" which in point of literary diction belong to the finest gems of the German language. They represent an entirely new form of German prose, the only one which in its plastic power and beauty can be compared with that of Goethe. They give us a portrait of himself, of his unlimited, passionate love of life, not only life as it was and is but as it might be, as it should be. Reflected in Schopenhauer and Richard Wagner we see his own splendid picture as it could only have been portrayed by his own authentic brush. What does he say?

Culture and genius are corresponding concepts like cause and effect. Only the "synthetic men with the courageous and calm eyes, the giants who, according to Schopenhauer's beautiful picture, stand on the highest mountain tops and call to each other, continuing throughout the centuries their high intellectual conversation, those individuals who constitute a kind of bridge across the wide stream of life's progress, loving the ageless life, humanity in its highest types, those alone are the moving power of culture." "Therefore is the evolutionary history of culture very brief, it is the Hellenization of the world, and in order to accomplish this, the Hellenic must be orientalized; the rhythmic play of both factors determines their path. Contrary to Haeckel he declares that the riddle of the universe lies only in the unchangeable. Therefore his passionate dislike of the historical, i. e., the study of the world under time conditions, to which all science belongs, which he persecutes with inexhaustible vigor. "Only a great aim can tame the breathless chase of the world and its exuberant analytical impulses, which devastates our present

age. Culture is unity of the artistic style in all expressions of a people's life; but we have lost its pure meaning, and much knowledge is unnecessary. What has culture to do with all this struggling scientific madness, which has no time for culture, and what purpose does science serve if it has no time for culture?" This vast accumulation of scientific data only creates a vast indigestion, it has no transforming power, it is contents without corresponding form; it lacks life and furnishes no real education. "Externally we are barbarians, satisfied if only the pigeon-holes of our memory are filled."

"We must again strive for the higher unity of contents and form; mere training must be discarded in favor of true culture." Personality has disappeared, and mediocrity, the "milieu," has become universal. Genius is discredited and science is popularized, i. e., effeminated, infantized, degraded.

"Christianity tends to burn every culture, not by force always, but by compact with historical training. History is still masked theology. History takes the place of the other powers, of art and religion. All foundations are torn into shreds, dissolved into liquid chaos through the modern man as proved by the philosophical parodist Hartman."

"Shall knowledge rule life, when it presupposes life?" Let us consider the Greeks: By their "know thyself" they learned to organize the chaos in their mode of thinking and became the prototypes of all future civilizations. The Greek idea of culture is unity in life, in thought, in appearance and in will. By the higher power of the moral nature did the Greeks gain the victory. Increase in truthfulness is preparation for true culture. But since Christianity with its high ideals has triumphed over the ancient systems of morality, even meditation on moral questions has vanished.

On the other hand, the fundamental idea of culture is to create in us the true man, the philosopher, artist, saint and thus to perfect nature. But it is difficult to look beyond oneself, and still more difficult to teach how to seek a higher self with all our might; but the consecration of culture only

comes with the intense desire to become whole. The second demand of culture is action. Indefinite longing must give place to conscious willing. The thirst for pure knowledge is not thirst for truth. Collectors and analysts only dissect nature, but the thinker wants to increase it, therefore their constant warfare.

Nietzsche bitterly condemns the average type of the professors of philosophy, as timid people who only teach a critique of words about words and have lost the proper respect for the dignity of philosophy. But love for truth is something terrible and powerful. The true thinker is a burning center of new forces, which threaten to annihilate existing conditions. Schopenhauer is the embodiment of such forces, fearless, simple in style, viewing life as a whole in order to interpret it as a whole.

Such was his judgment on contemporary life and thought, as presented in the four essays. In the first of these essays he deals with Strauss, whom he contemptuously calls a typical "culture-philistine," the high priest of this worship of a mistaken civilization. With such contempt for existing conditions and his high ideals of life and art in his soul he hastens to Bayreuth where these ideals should be tested by integral realities. Disgusted with the analytical efforts of many talents he longs for the synthesis of genius. The dissonance of knowledge, the groping for standards of mere skill, this greatest misery of man drive him to the realm of art. It is tragedy in particular with its great rhythm of passion, which lifts us up to those heights of inspiration where we become eager and willing to sacrifice ourselves in the battle of "existence," where the soothing balm of illusion relieves us from the convulsions of our will manifestations. This tragic elevation of the individual into the realm of the superhuman is the great ennobling process of man.

The one man who offers this redemptive balm is Richard Wagner, who philosophizes in tones and constructs systems of thought without the concrete form. "The man who gives

us art, dramatically set forth, is he who renews morality, purifies the state, reforms culture, and sets the relations of man to man upon a nobler basis." "No sufferer in the struggle of life can dispense with art, just as no one can dispense with sleep." "To be free and to be oneself is the artist's great message. The free man may be both good and evil, for honesty in things evil is better than mere submission to traditional morality."

Nietzsche's mission in Bayreuth was an utter failure. He was completely disappointed both in the new art and in the new audience. He had heard in Wagner's music something of the noble Dionysiac rage. He expected to find in the turbulent choruses of the great composer a primitive German culture akin to early Greek culture, but there is a vast difference between the two and Nietzsche was preëminently Greek. The delicate joyous spirit of Hellas had nothing in common with the medieval, barbaric Nibelung-Cycle and Teutonic cast. Moreover, Wagner himself jarred the sensitive nature of Nietzsche by his coarse humor on the one hand and his leanings towards a semi-catholic cult on the other. "How," he says, "could the Germans find lacking in Wagner what we Halcyonians find lacking in him—*la gaja scienza*, the light feet, wit, fire, grace, reasonableness, the dance of the stars, arrogant intellectuality, the quivering light of the truth, the smooth sea-perfection?" "Arrogant intellectuality" expresses the life-note of Nietzsche. He fled into the Bohemian forests, in order to recover in perfect solitude from the shock which had shattered his whole being. Such shocks are never entirely overcome. His great intellect, indeed, covered the break, but he was a changed man. His ability for systematic constructive work seemed paralyzed, the diamond had received a mighty blow and nothing but fragments remained. Fragments are henceforth the creations of his genius. "Menschliches, Allzu Menschliches" are aphorisms, transitional thoughts, preparing for a new soil: the art philosopher becomes a moral philosopher. His solitude increased his misery,

and the physical sufferings of this time were intensified by his incessant mental labor. All his writings indicate a passionate, feverish endeavor to find a way out of the old to a new field of labor and happiness. He speaks of the dawn of a new and profounder knowledge, of the plowshare which is to tear open the old soil and make it receptive for new seed, a merry science is to displace the old serious problem. The fundamental element in it is an ethical one. He is seeking a new ethical foundation for culture, but whither is he drifting? more and more into solitude and wilderness, from the sunny fields of Hellas into the cavern of Zarathustra.

His wonderful skill in subtle, psychological delineations, his great moral earnestness, his intense hatred of dogmatic traditions and inheritances against which he fights with fury, his artistic temperament so diametrically opposite to scientific exactness, his profound insight into the defects of all philosophical systems—all these drive him ultimately into systematic negations and the final outcome is the negation of morality. He prefers to call himself a non-moralist. Here more than anywhere else does Nietzsche show his inferiority to Kant not in his aspiration for truth but in his instinct of truth, i. e., in scientific spirit. Kant had accepted the reality of the moral as well as of the concrete world although his anti-metaphysical efforts made this acceptance difficult and led to unsatisfactory solutions. Nietzsche simplifies the process by excluding evil brought out especially in his "Beyond good and evil." If evil is physical imperfection or social inferiority then the good must become the useful and the aristocratic, quite correct, if there is no metaphysical world and the origin of evil cannot be explained. Morality is thus excluded from the sphere of the metaphysical. He is in this respect more consistent than those who speak of ethics as of something self-understood whose foundations are eternally the same. Nietzsche's love of truth preferred to lose himself in the abstruse rather than mix dogma and science. Such seems to be the position which the lonely wanderer had worked out for

himself in the desert wilderness of the high mountains and which he puts in to the mouth of Zarathustra.

Zarathustra seems to signify the climax of Nietzsche's activity, but the book appears to us the most unsatisfactory. Such centaur-like formations, half poetry and half philosophy create distrust. It often appears as though the form was paramount and the contents only secondary. He certainly has descended from his mental height, and his second style, a sort of prophetic style is more a symptom of decline than of improvement. The poetic beauty of the poem is certainly sublime but the solution of the problem of the poem is utterly missed. The signs of a progressive paralysis began to appear, his disgust with Bayreuth, its effeminacy, its idealistic deceptions and its undermining of the conscience had overwhelmed him and he entered upon the path of a brave pessimism filling his over-wrought soul. Though Zarathustra is not the climax in Nietzsche's development it is at least one of the epochs. He inaugurates a new type of style and abandons his former method of psychological dissection. He who with such sure instinct had once turned his back upon time and age, but who could not land in the region of the ageless because lightning had destroyed his compass, he turns now to the real task of his life, to found a system of ethics without metaphysics. He who had in youthful enthusiasm proclaimed that he would enter with flying colors through the gate of the beautiful into the land of the metaphysical now applies the axe to metaphysics and is satisfied with the rays of positivistic phraseology. Morality without metaphysics is a contradiction and therefore an impossibility. The constructive philosopher becomes an analytical psychologist, weaker and weaker grows his resistance against the polyp-like arms of time which drag him back into the old camp until, finally, he too discusses morality from the historical standpoint, i. e., as an evolutionary phenomenon. He begins to preach the gospel of the overman. The goal of human development is

not the soft and smooth happiness that comes from surrendering your all in behalf of all, but in the rise and training of specially endowed individuals. Therefore, we must use our utmost efforts to increase in these individuals ambition and aspiration, their master impulses, and to suppress all impulses which arise in the minds and hearts of the strong to exercise love for your neighbor, coöperation, and the tendency for statecraft. Thus his "Herrenmoral," his aristocratic anarchism and his superman get into the foreground of his discussions culminating finally in his "Antichrist" in which he fearfully arraigns the current dogmatism of Christianity as well as the teachings of Jesus. The thinker who saw the goal and mission of the race in the deification of individual overmen considers it as his highest duty to battle against the omnipotent God of Christianity and against the reverence so humbly paid Him. He therefore preaches the necessity of hastening the development of man into the overman, it is not to be left to the slow process of natural selection, but must be accelerated through the redeeming power of an omnipotent, overpowering faith, faith in the eternal reincarnation. To the ever-returning cycle of all things belongs also our life, this same life—an eternal life. This faith is to take the place of the current belief in an eternal life beyond the earth. This life, however, does not consist in happiness or comfort, its principle is "the will to rule," the struggle for life is the struggle for power and might. Only the great man can lead the great life. He prophesies a new nobility, a coming aristocracy not of rank or possession, but of mind and of character. All democratic levelling is a sign of decay, not only of the state, but of man himself. He therefore denounces the Christian principle of brotherhood and equality as immoral and dangerous to life itself. Over against this morality of equality or "slave morality" as he calls it, he emphasizes the morality of inequality, of privilege and of race; and this "morality of masters" with its higher duty and responsibility

does not appeal to the crowd, "die Vielzuvielen," but to the few select who rise above the crowd. Summing it all up we find that he aimed at nothing less than the recasting or inversion of all values.

Such, in brief, is the tumultuous life and thought of Friedrich Nietzsche. Taking him all in all he was a man of profound grasp and most comprehensive intellect, endowed with the creative power of the artist and inspired by an intense desire for truth, gentle and tender, like a child, and sensitive and affectionate, like a woman. We have approached the truth near enough in our age that a man like Nietzsche either had to find it or perish in the attempt. Only one more weight he lacked to lower the scale, he could not think mathematically; without the compass of mathematical coördinates, he surrendered his sails to the breeze of beauty. But he will always be classed among the greatest writers of German literature. His style is of magic charm, his sentences all bear the birthmark of music and give the impression of tone and rhythmic splendor, they combine beauty and truth, they are as clear as crystal and being in this respect so different from other philosophical writers one unconsciously forgets under the impression of beautiful diction to inquire into the logic of the argument. The artist Nietzsche has therefore misled thousands of honest searchers after light under the spell of his art.

What then are the fallacies of this genius? Some have said that long before the fatal year of 1889, when his mental health broke down utterly, there had been times in his life when he was not sane. Be that as it may, true it is, that he saw life only from the angle of the beautiful and never tested the correctness of his vision by the values of the integral world within which and with which we live. He failed in the final solution of his great problem, the glorification of life, not because he became mad, but because he always lacked the gift of thinking with mathematical preciseness. While his mind

was synthetically inclined and metaphysically on the right track, he disregarded mathematics because he considered it to be without a metaphysical foundation. Mathematics does not, indeed, lead to metaphysics but on the contrary is directly based upon it and is therefore best fitted to interpret metaphysics in terms of science. Nietzsche was undoubtedly master, but master without a servant. A philosopher who lacks the mathematical talent should never undertake to solve the riddle of the universe, the problem of life. With intellectual arrogance Nietzsche boldly reached out for the highest goal but an undercurrent carried him past the victor's crown. This undercurrent was his inherent dogmatism, the unscientific habit in his make-up. This defect led him to group art, religion, metaphysics and philosophy under one head and to place them as a unit over against the historic, by which he meant the products of time, our unfruitful science.* But only a mathematical mind can comprehend units. The concept science itself is a composite one, separable in two directions, one method dealing with the external, with form, the physical, the other with the internal, with contents, the metaphysical. The mediator between the two is mathematics, which might therefore be called formal metaphysics. Nietzsche failed in the recasting or inverting of all values because the change of the meaning of current concepts is only legitimate when based on either empirical or metaphysical principles, as was done by Socrates, the "first theoretical man," the much-abused "vertex of the universe," who employed the dialectic method in purifying and straightening out old values. Since then, especially since Kant, this dialectic method has passed into the stricter metaphysical method expressed in definite mathematical forms. Nietzsche failed to do justice to the study of the natural science because he only knew within himself the ethico-aesthetic impulse, because he was predominantly of Dionysiac cast. He knew nothing of the pure science of nature and never observed the investigator in his laboratory,

this unselfish, heroic servant of truth, who never asks for rewards. The same is true of his position to our accepted code of morals. In his attempt to answer the two great cardinal questions in ethics, the question of moral freedom and of the origin of evil he forgets that the appearance of man and the appearance of evil are contemporaneous historical facts and simply takes into account the select few, the best in contradistinction from the mass of humanity, "den Vielzuvielen," and calls it "Herrenmoral," as though any man could rise to the level of the best without the aid and coöperation of his fellowmen. In his "Antichrist" he writes on Christianity with so much unbalanced heat and rancour that his opinion in the nature of the case can have neither weight nor value. His contention is that Christ's preaching is not the Christian's practice. "The only Christian," he says, "died on the cross." Christianity is ushered into the world when paganism and polytheism are in hopeless decay. It preaches the hope of personal salvation and the fear of personal damnation and is so far forth egotistical. The Christian doctrine of love, charity, benevolence, with the large promises of future life, come at the moment when the world is in a condition of utter degeneration, degradation and decay, and kindle the wretchedness of mankind with new hopefulness. There is nothing more abhorrent than the Christian's altruistic principle: "Love thy neighbor as thyself" or "do unto others as thou wouldest they should do unto thee," for pity and sympathy, from which this morality springs, are the most ignoble of the so-called virtues, in as much as they are founded on selfish fear of evil for ourselves; and the religion of love, pity and altruism, therefore, rests upon the fear of pain. Nietzsche denies the universal human experience of an innate consciousness of justice, truth, honor and mercy on the basis of which our universal code of morals is built and claims that the natural man has no innate conception of right and wrong, that these ideals have only been instilled into us by our

parents. Originally primitive man had no conscious scruples, he killed his fellowman and committed all sorts of outrages to benefit himself, being convinced that his success made him a good and pious person. Then came the period of slave morality, the morality of the horde when the majority of the weaklings in the tribe began to fear the success of the pious and good few who killed them, robbed them, lied to them and committed all sorts of evil against them. Consequently the horde established from selfish, sordid motives a new code of morals which condemned murder, stealing and lying. This is the Christian morality of modern times and Nietzsche attempts to abolish it and to recur to more heroic times and ideals, when the strong man can rule himself and do just what he likes. Goodness and wickedness are alike to him and to him nothing is to be forbidden. This man is the "Übermensch" the overman, who is "Jenseits von Gut und Böse." The fallacy of his argument lies in the fundamental onesidedness of his unscientific reasoning. The deepest problem of life is the problem of being, and Nietzsche never touched that problem by any serious inquiry into man's relation to the organic world. He despised such inquiry into causality and historicity as unmetaphysical, but at the same time establishes quite lustily his own interpretation of man's historicity, without seeing the absurd contradiction. The unfortunate part of it all is the fact that his disciples lay so much stress upon the later writings of Nietzsche which bear the impress of impending paresis and for which he should not be held accountable. What an antidote we have to Nietzscheism in the interpretation of life as given by Jesus! He too emphasized the will to live as the highest good, but the crown of life is in his estimate not the power to rule but the will to serve and the strength for sacrifice, not the will to live for self but the will to enlarge the life of all by imparting one's own strength to those who need more life, not life eternal that depends upon the eternal return of the few overmen but life eternal that

comes to everyone who reaches down and up into the all-embracing life of the eternal God and Father of all.

Haeckel and Nietzsche have left their monumental impress upon humanity, they will continue to live in the world of intellect and of beauty, the one as the supreme seer of the manifold manifestations in the phenomenal world, the other as the supreme master in the art of expression, but neither will be known to posterity as having solved the "Riddle of the Universe."

LANCASTER, PA.

VI.

CONTEMPORARY RELIGIOUS AND THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT IN GREAT BRITAIN AND AMERICA.

BY THE REV. A. S. WEBER, D.D.

THEOLOGY IMPORTANT AND NECESSARY.

Among contemporary thinkers there are those whose confidence in the importance and necessity of theology has been seriously shaken, if not wholly destroyed. As read by them, the history of Christian doctrine is nothing but a melancholy process of displacing the formulas of one age by the speculative theories of a succeeding period without attaining to anything like finality or abiding satisfaction in regard to the deep questions which those formulas essay to answer. Mediæval Christianity, for instance, basing its dogmas upon the authority of the Church and the majority vote of its councils, was successfully assailed by the Reformers of the sixteenth century, and many of its long-cherished doctrines overthrown. Those Reformers rested their theological conceptions upon the authority of the Scriptures, whilst later Protestantism made its appeal to the authority of the Confessions which issued from Wittenberg, Heidelberg, Geneva, or Westminster. In turn, these likewise came to be questioned, and, under the examination to which they were subjected, obliged to make room for others differently grounded. The mighty movement, inaugurated by the great regenerative genius of modern theology, Schleiermacher, appealed from the outward authority of Scripture and Confession to the inward authority of the godly consciousness and personal experience of devout

and thoughtful believers, and thus undermined the standards on which an earlier faith had been resting.

Those who have read the biography of Schleiermacher will recall that by heredity and training he was pietistically inclined, and that for this reason he very naturally made his appeal for the truth of Christianity to the consciousness and experience of the believer. In doing this he led Christian thought to take an onward step which has proved of immense significance and importance. What he contributed has been associated with much of the spiritual progress recorded since in the history of European and American Christianity. It was the saving and vitalizing element in the thought and life of his own generation, and of the two succeeding generations. It was an important and necessary reaction from the formalism, literalism, and confessionalism which like a blight had settled down upon Christendom. Someone has truthfully said that it was a rediscovery of the treasure buried in the field of the Saviour's parable. It translated the opinionated right of private judgment into the modest duty of personal experience. It tempered the hardness of private judgment, and furnished the key to many whose judgment was but ill equipped. It gave the believer a right to speak not only on faith but on the central theme of Christian theology. It gave him a new and personal interest in theological thought no less than in the Gospel to be interpreted and believed.

Notwithstanding their large contribution to the progress of thought and the deepening of religious life, those doctrinal views founded on personal experience were bound, like their predecessors, to be challenged as not being final. Certain correctives, it would be discovered, had to be applied; certain supplemental and essential truths needed to receive due recognition and accentuation. In the opinion of a large and growing number of religious leaders in thought and activity, these correctives and supplementations to Schleiermacher's views were introduced by Ritschl and those belonging to his school of theological thinkers. It is the distinction of the

Ritschlians, not as some have supposed, to cast us anew upon the authority of Christian experience, but upon the experience of an objective, historic, and positive Revelation made by Jesus Christ our Lord, the record of which is preserved for us in the Gospels. The content of that revelation carries us immeasurably beyond the possible experience of any human being. This must become manifest to anyone that will pause to consider facts carefully. If personal consciousness and experience were final, would not faith have to give way to knowledge? Would it not cease in that case to be an abiding virtue of Christian character? But what can our finite consciousness and experience teach us with reference to some of the fundamentally important convictions of our faith? What is to be known through experience of the preëxistence of Christ, of the assurance that all things are working together for the good of those that love God, of the ultimate triumph of Christianity in history, or of the glorious consummation of all things in the Kingdom that is to be and of which there shall be no end? These things, and others of similar vastness and import, are of faith—faith in revelation—not of consciousness and experience. They challenge us, not to attempt their verification at the bar of subjective experiment, but to accept them by making "the supreme venture" of an obedient faith. In reminding Christian thought of this unquestionable fact, Ritschl has taken a step beyond Schleiermacher, and so far has superseded him not only as a technical theologian, but as a practical religious leader.

Wherever this is properly apprehended, the modification in theological statements and their articulation into a reasoned system made necessary in consequence, is cheerfully and promptly made. If, like its predecessors, the type of Christianity which was engrossed with subjective experiences must give place to a type which centers in a faith in and obedience to an objective revelation, the requirement should lead no one to the supposition that theological inquiry and systemitiza-

tion is a hopeless quest, nor that theology itself is really unimportant and unnecessary. On the contrary, the successive changes in theology which have taken place in the past, and which doubtless will continue to take place in the future, should be regarded as an evidence of religious growth and development, and as an affirmation of the necessity of sustaining a vital faith and securing consecration to religious duty by ever-enlarging and more rationally satisfying conceptions of theology. It is conceivable, of course, that there may be godly individuals without much theology, but the contention recently made by the distinguished Englishman who delivered last year's lectures at Yale on the Lyman Beecher Foundation, to the effect that without theology "you cannot for long have a godly Church" will commend itself as valid to the vast majority of thinking Christians. A Church without theology, he insists, "will soon become a feeble Church, and then a worldly Church. It will not have grit enough to resist the externalism of the world, its clear definitions, and its positive ways. The inner man which really copes with the world is not merely the pious sympathetic man, but the man permeated with the power of an objective Gospel, its facts and its truths. It is our objective theological base that the formidable critics assail, and we shall never secure our base against them by escaping, while neglecting theology, into the subjective piety of merely personal Christian consciousness and experience."

In his brilliant article in the initial number of *The Harvard Theological Review* on *The Call To Theology*, Professor Francis G. Peabody deals with these same questions and arrives at corresponding conclusions. The signs of a reaction from theology, as seen by him and mentioned in the opening paragraphs of his essay, are numerous and unmistakable; but these very signs of reaction give an added emphasis to the importance and necessity of theology for the minister and for the Church. If to many the history of theology appears to be a dreary record of profitless controversies from which

they turn to a self-originated, contemporary, up-to-date religion, with its material in the events of the day, or the witness of personal experience, they should allow themselves to be reminded that in so doing they foolishly abandon the definite province which in the specialization of knowledge, has been assigned to the Church and its appointed leaders. Of course, the mystic call to the practice of the presence of God should be heard by such leaders. Amid the whirlwind and fire and earthquake of the time, their hearts should listen and their wills obey the still small voice of the Spirit. But, "under the new conditions of the modern world, its resistless movement of inquiry, its universal cultivation of the scientific method, its complete abandonment of obscurantism and ambiguity, a new and not less serious call is heard to devout and holy thinking. The future of organized religion will depend, not alone on new expressions of piety and new enlistments for service, but—in an unprecedented degree—on a revival, among those who represent religion, of intellectual authority and leadership." In connection with these general observations on the call to theology, Professor Peabody specifies several particular considerations which deserve mention by way of reinforcing its imperativeness in our day.

Unless the Christian Church is willing frankly to retreat from the pretence of intellectual leadership in matters religious, the conditions of the age require it to become a more efficient organ of rational and candid thought. Not less of religious fervor and not less of practical activity are demanded of the representatives of religion, but a new accession of intellectual power, the capacity to translate the message of the Timeless into the dialect of the present age. (1) "It must be remembered that any one who thinks about religion theologizes, whether he will or no. The only refuge from theology is to stop thinking about religion, and that is impossible except to one who stops thinking altogether. The only alternatives are those of a molluscan theology and a vertebrate theology; a theology which is all foreground, and

a theology which has perspective, background, and relations.” (2) “There should be recalled the coincidence which has occurred at many points in history of a revival of theology with a revival of religion. Religious zeal is not repressed by learning or fostered by ignorance. The epochs which have most indelibly marked the progress of Christianity have been epochs in the history of theology. Protestantism, Methodism and Tractarianism were movements of religious vitality, but they began within the precincts of universities. It is suicidal to anticipate a revival of religion which shall be dissociated from a revival of theology. The only practical choice is between a theology which gives chains and a theology which gives wings.” (3) There is an inspirational and quickening power in acquainting oneself with theology. “Many a minister of religion would gladly testify to the tonic effect upon his spiritual power of intimacy with the mind of a master; the chastening discipline of acquaintance with great teachers or great thoughts. No preacher is safe from spiritual atrophy who does not habitually exercise himself in the intellectual athletics of his profession.” (4) Coöperation between the teachers and the preachers of religion is promoted by a knowledge of theology. “The Devil laughs, it has been said, at a divided Church. It must be not less amusing to him to see the skirmish-line of theology advancing to new attacks while the commanders of ecclesiasticism retreat to the breastworks of the past. This alienation between the conduct of pastoral life and the teaching of theological science may be observed in all countries. Nothing repels the best minds from the service of religion more sternly than this schism between its science and its art. What Samuel Adams said of the American colonies is true of the ministers of religion in their relation to the teachers of theology: if they do not hang together, they will be hung separately. Either the theologians must lead the Church, or the Church must cease to lead the world.”

This bare outline of the course of Dr. Peabody's reasoning in the illuminating and convincing contribution he has made

to the discussion of our present topic, does it but scant justice. It may suffice, however, to send the readers of this *Review* to look for the journal in which the article has appeared and to read it in its entirety. One is persuaded that those doing so will be led to a new vision of the importance and necessity of theological learning, and possibly it will move them also to a determination of doing personally what they can to change the prevailing conditions of indifference to theology. It ought to induce ministers of the Gospel, at least, to read the best of present-day theological treatises¹ that are available, as well as current discussions of religious questions in theological periodicals. If this were done, it would be as common to find upon the tables and shelves of study-rooms the masterpieces of ancient and modern theologians, as it now is to see fourth-rate sermonic helps and books of only ephemeral interest and character. If this were done the subscriptions lists of able and informing theological reviews would contain as many ministers' names as do those of *The Saturday Evening Post* and similar popular publications that are at present catering to the fancies of the hour.

CHRIST'S PERSON THE SUSTAINED AND SUSTAINING
SPIRITUAL MIRACLE.

Amid the mental stir and turmoil, the moral doubts and perplexities, caused by the religious controversies of our time, it is well to be kept mindful of the supremacy and central significance of Christ's unique personality. "Who say ye that I am?" has ever been, and will always continue to be, the question than which none is more worth asking, none more worth answering. It was put by Jesus, not out of idle curiosity, not with a desire to obtain for Himself a word of praise or applause, and not to clear His own mind of any suspicion or uncertainty in regard to Himself and His mission.

¹ It may be worth noting that Dr. Forsyth in his Yale Lectures calls Professor Brown's book, reviewed in these notes, April, 1907, "the most able outline of theology which we now possess in English."

Sure of Himself and of the work the Father had given Him to do, Jesus neither required nor received the testimony of men. Sure also that the religious future of mankind and the achievement of His redemptive purposes, depended on men's intelligent apprehension and acceptance of Him and on their consequent spontaneous obedience to Him as Lord and Master, he instituted the inquiry under the promptings of highest and holiest motives. If, during the months He had been living with the disciples, spoken and acted freely in their presence, allowed them to ask their own questions, receive their own impressions, draw their own inferences, and gather their own conclusions—if in this way they had come to recognize in Him an absolutely new and incomparable figure and character, the incarnate ideal of righteousness and truth, of goodness and love, then, whatever else, for the time, might be lacking in them, the future realization of His saving purposes was abundantly assured. Hence the joy and gratitude which burst from His heart upon the reception of the satisfactory answer from them to His important question.

It had taken a long time, and required much patience and forbearance on Jesus' part, to bring disciples, dull of mind and heart, to an adequate understanding of His person and dignity. But He did not frown upon the slowness of their growth and development, nor did He expel them from His company because they did not at once apprehend His character. He had sympathy with them in their difficulties, allowed each mind according to personal peculiarities to work its way into the light. By way of suggestion or direct instruction, He contributed, indeed, what was needed for the accomplishing of His ends, but He protected at the same time the individual freedom of every man He was training. Deeply impressive and most instructive is this method of the great Teacher. Nothing was to be gained, He knew—and His followers should long ago have learned the lesson from Him—by forcing any man beyond his own convictions. Then, and always, His method suggests, nothing but freest inquiry and freest

conviction could be of any permanent service in the quest after truth. Inquiry must be encouraged, honest questionings must be invited, conscienceless acquiescence in this or that intellectual statement, without the approving judgment of reason, must be deprecated. In the days of His flesh Jesus neither desired nor demanded homage and acknowledgment as the incarnate Son of the Father except from convinced disciples. And He who is yesterday, to-day, and forever the same, cannot be supposed to have a different desire or to make such a demand now. What He does do, is the employment of similar methods in revealing Himself to men, and He expects them in docile thoughtfulness to allow the Spirit to lead them to a knowledge of the truth.

The bearing of these observed facts regarding the method of self-revelation of Jesus, and His attitude toward His early followers, upon those now in search of the truth concerning His person and character, can be readily understood. Merely verbal statements, whatever their nature or source, cannot be supposed to carry with them the power, to the majesty of whose authority the human mind must unquestioningly bow. No such power is resident, for instance, in the phrase "conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary," nor in that which declares Jesus to be "God of God, very God of very God, begotten, not made," and not even in that which says that "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." This does not mean that these words may not express the truth as to Christ's person, but that truth even if expressed by them cannot by way of external authority overwhelm our rational nature and force upon us an assured and intelligent conviction. And what is true with reference to the phrases instanced, is true of all verbal statements whether coming to us from the lips of men who spake as they were moved by the Spirit, from those that sat in ecumenical councils, or from learned divines whose doctrinal conceptions are systematically arranged in what are known as confessional standards. They may be guides for us

in coming to a knowledge of the truth, but the truth which they are formulated to express must be made our own through other channels. The sustained and sustaining spiritual miracle of Christ's unique person, must be—and one is persuaded *can* be—realized by placing oneself as the first disciples did, in an obedient and open-minded way, under the method of instruction by which the first followers of the Saviour were gradually led into the truth.

For one thing, it is practically impossible, once our attention is called to Jesus, to escape from the impression that no other historic personage can, in the light of what it must be acknowledged the world owes to Him, claim anything approaching an equal moral and spiritual importance. Lecky's classic observation as to "the well-spring of whatever is purest and best in human life" is to the point and may here be recalled: "It was reserved," he affirms, "for Christianity to present to the world an ideal Character, which through all the changes of eighteen centuries has inspired the hearts of men with impassioned love; has shown itself capable of acting on all ages, nations, temperaments, and conditions; has been not only the highest pattern of virtue but the strongest incentive to its practice; and has exercised so deep an influence that it may be truly said that the simple record of three short years of active life has done more to regenerate and to soften mankind than all the disquisitions of philosophers, and all the exhortations of moralists."² Very few, acquainted with history, will feel inclined to question this statement. No one dwelling in a Christian land can be ignorant of the fact that Jesus has succeeded in turning the current of human life into new channels, and in bettering social and moral conditions on every side. Multitudes of the noblest men and saintliest women find their stay in Him. His personal influence impels men everywhere disinterestedly to establish and at personal charges to maintain, beneficent enterprises which are the glory of our civilization and which were wholly unknown before

² *History of European Morals*, Vol. 2, pp. 8-9.

Jesus' advent. Unnumbered hosts find solace in his friendship and love, and a supporting strength in the consciousness of His approval of their purposes and efforts, their self-denials and sacrifices, such as nothing else has the power of bringing to their souls. Jesus, beyond all possibility of doubt, has delivered such from the power of darkness, and translated them from selfishness and sin into a light wherein contentment with ordinary moral attainments and the achievement of mere worldly success in amassing wealth or winning fame, is utterly unsatisfying. Life, if worth living, must address itself, they are persuaded, to highest ethical ends and beautify itself by achieving virtuous and enduring character.

How did Jesus originally win, how does He age after age continue to wield, over the wills of men this unparalleled, this measureless influence? What is it that so powerfully draws, so firmly holds the attention, and so imperatively commands the adoration of mankind? Questions like these must inevitably occur to thoughtful minds, and, in our case as in that of the first disciples, candid and unprejudiced reflection upon them and the amazing facts out of which they arise, can lead to but one answer: Jesus is what the Gospel narratives declare He professed Himself to be, namely, One, the only One, who in a perfectly sinless and absolutely holy nature speaks to fellowmen from the Divine rather than the human side; who in proclaiming forgiveness and pointing out the means of restoration and salvation carried His own authentication; and who in His perfect oneness with God and His perfect, self-sacrificing love for men revealed in human terms the eternal Father and thus assured us of being his children. This, in general terms, is the answer to the questions suggested by the contemplation of Jesus' influence, first over the lives of the original disciples, and ever since, over constantly increasing numbers, bestowing upon them the same hallowing blessings with undiminished vitality and power. Is the evidence available sufficient to justify us in accepting the prime affirmations of the answer as valid and satisfactory? If it can

be shown that it is, a long step forward in the direction of the end here aimed at will have been taken.

One of the primarily important affirmations in the general answer to which our inquiry has led us, has to do with the perfect sinlessness and holiness of Christ's character. That claim vindicated, the difficulties attending the acceptance of the others will have been greatly reduced, if not totally removed. There have always been those ready to deny the sinlessness of Jesus, but hitherto they have invariably made a sorry shift of it in adducing arguments supporting their denials, the latest that has come under one's notice in Schmidt's brilliant portraiture of *The Prophet of Nazareth* being no better than the rest. All of them blink a well-known and verifiable biographical fact, namely, that the holier a man becomes the more distinctly and painfully conscious he is of sin and personal imperfection. The best, therefore, of our race have always been the humblest, the readiest to confess their own unworthiness. Their progress toward the light of God discloses to them increasingly the dreadful darkness in their own souls. If Jesus like the rest of us was not without sin, how shall we account for his being an exception to this universal law of self-reproach and voluntary confession of sin before God? Whilst giving to the world new ideas concerning purity and holiness, and lifting men into the clearest ethical and religious light, He discovers neither spot nor stain in His own character. He knew as no one else ever did, the holiness required by a Holy Father in order to fellowship with Him, and the awfulness of sin and guilt, but He never gives expression to personal shame, never utters a word of penitence, never asks forgiveness, feels no need of a Saviour, and never yearns for the restoration of a broken communion with the Father. On the contrary He defies His enemies to convict Him of sin, declares solemnly He always does those things which please God, and affirms His perfect oneness with Him in both inward will and purpose, and outward practice and achievement. This positive holiness undeviatingly main-

tained by Him through life in His devout relationship to God, has its counterpart in the perfect and self-sacrificing love and service toward men. Is it within the power or scope of the human mind to think of love, human or divine, greater or more perfect than His? For the best that we know of God, no less than for the best we know of man, we are indebted to him. Instead of regarding God as a cruel and avenging King, enthroned in the heavens and largely indifferent to His subjects on earth, we have been taught by Christ to think of Him as our Father, His heart throbbing with sympathy for us, His power devising the means of helping and blessing us—a Father inviting His erring children to return home for forgiveness, and assuring them that He is making all things, except right, to bend to their service and blessedness. The Rev. Dr. Marcus Dods, to whom contemporary Christianity is so largely indebted for helpful religious suggestions, says: "It is in Christ that we meet the highest that we know. In his person, speaking human language, mingling freely in human society, the world saw that which permanently raised its idea of God. Seeing Christ, it was God men saw, and saw Him to be more and better than they thought. But for any mere man to plan and carry through what might seem to be an incarnation of God would prove itself to be an impossible audacity. . . . Inconsistency, extravagance, grotesque assumption, unjustifiable claims, and unfulfilled pretensions, would betray the would-be incarnate one at every point. But Jesus in the judgment of generation after generation of godly souls has perfectly fulfilled His part. God is revealed in Him, and our hope of knowing God better is our hope of knowing Christ better."³ This revelation in the sinlessly pure and perfectly holy person of Christ constitutes a spiritual miracle truly unique, performed by Jesus alone among all the millions of men throughout the ages and nations of the world—a miracle whose stupendous significance is such a con-

³ *The Supernatural in Christianity*, pp. 108-109. T. and T. Clarke, Edinburgh.

vincing and sustaining moral power that all the other miracles ascribed to Him may be regarded as of little consequence. Little wonder, therefore, that Jesus should have made His appeal to the men whom He was training, not by impressing them with His miraculous conception and birth, not by reminding them of outward wonder-works, but by His perfect and unexampled sinlessness and holy love. Is not appeal to this fact continuously valid and adequately efficacious in leading men to a knowledge of Christ's peerless personality, and to the acceptance by them of His uplifting and saving message?

With the exception of the few negatively disposed critics of the Gospel narratives, to whom allusion has been made, and whose views are entirely negligible, earnest students of the Life which is the light of men, will not think it necessary to deny as factually true what has now been emphasized in regard to Christ's person. Christians may confidently regard the fact of the Saviour's sinless and holy personality as belonging to the things which cannot be shaken, and rest their religious trust upon it as upon a rock. But when it comes to the explanation of the fact, which will be seen of course to be another matter, difficulties bulk large in the way of bringing men, differently constituted and differently trained, to common ground. In these circumstances, would it not be wise to lay stress upon the *fact* which must remain, whatever interpretation we put upon it, rather than upon any particular *explanation of it* that may be proposed? It is essential that we should confidently believe in Christ as the authentic revelation of God, and as having made known unto us the only way by which restoration to reconciled and saved relation can be obtained by His disobedient and sinful children. It is not essential that we should understand what it was in the nature and constitution of His unique and mysterious person that enabled Him to achieve His sinless and holy distinction among men. Among those whose lives showed most of the spirit of the Lord whom they loved and delighted to serve,

there have been men who did not hesitate to explain the mystery of Christ's person as implying that the Infinite Eternal Spirit of God, the Life and Power from which the universe proceeds and in which it holds together, lived actually and absolutely as man in the person of Jesus of Nazareth. Others, perhaps equally sincere and possibly as thoroughly consecrated to the service of God, regarded such an interpretation too great a strain upon the imagination, too baffling to the mind, and too severe a tax upon faith, and therefore sought another and to them more satisfying explanation of the inscrutable mystery that is presented in Christ's person. When we remind ourselves, therefore, that no man either understands or ever will understand the nature of God; and that no man in consequence can claim to understand the relation that subsists between the Father and Son, or how the Son of God connects Himself with humanity in the person of Christ—when we remind ourselves of all this, should not personal humility prompt every man to deal generously and sympathetically with others whose interpretations on this point are not in accord with their own? Paul pronounced a benediction upon all who *loved* the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, not only on those who *thought* as He did on this most difficult of all problems. Much has been sacrificed, many a page of the Church's history marred by ugly blots of uncharitableness, in forgetting this apostolic example and substituting hateful and unjustified anathemas.

And yet, when all this is said, the last word on this important subject has not been spoken. Great as is "the mystery of godliness," and "passing all understanding," like the peace of God, it may at the same time commend itself to Christian faith as is shown by the writings of Paul, of Peter, and of John, and likewise in those, who have been conspicuous leaders of Christian thought, in every age since. Such ones have seen much in the actually sinless life led by Jesus while on earth quite in harmony with the supposition that He was God incarnate. His ability to reveal God to the utmost

perfection the human mind can conceive of, they have regarded an adequate, self-authenticating evidence of His being God the Son in human form, and so, resting their faith upon this as the best and most satisfactory solution, they have found in it an inspiring and abiding joy for the present life and an assured hope of blessedness for that which is to come. The same is likewise true of the vast majority of those whose faithful devotion to God has since then been the glory of Christendom, and one fails to see why the solution of the problem accepted by them, should not be regarded by us as sufficiently sustained in their experience to warrant us making it the sustaining one for our own lives. Much that is receiving emphasis in present-day thought should, indeed, be of special assistance to us in seeing the reasonableness of the idea of incarnation. The nature and character of God as absolute love, and the immanence of His Spirit in the universe, as touching everything and entering really and energetically into men and their work—these conceptions of Deity have never before been so clearly known and appreciated. Why, in the light of the truth of the Immanence of Love, therefore, should it be thought by us a thing incredible, that God should become flesh in the person of his Son, in order to reconcile the erring children whom he loved unto Himself? Is it not rather the reverse that should be expected of absolute love? Is it not the most credible, the necessary, thing to be thought of him as Love? If there is anything more than another that love feels impelled to do, it is to effect the most intimate relations possible, and to establish as complete and perfect a union between itself and the object loved as can be imagined. The best that the love of a person can bestow upon one that is loved is itself. This is the inspiring thought which, it may be remembered, apprehended the poetic genius of Robert Browning when writing "Saul"—one of finest literary gems he has given to the world and containing the famous passage which in religious writings at least is most frequently quoted. In connection with it, David is repre-

sented as attempting to soothe the disordered mind of the first King of Israel. Whilst ranging from subject to subject in search of consolation and restoration for the saddened heart and clouded mind of the Ruler, his heart begins to glow with a sympathetic warmth and tenderness toward the sufferer. Unbidden, the inference suggests itself to him that if he, David, can love Saul, the King, with such a sincere and disinterested love, much more must the Divine Love reach out towards the conquered and fallen man! And, following the gleam of thought thus suggested, David arrives at the conclusion that God *will* reach out to the man, and reach out to him *in a human form*. Then he exclaims, in words which support and confirm the contention upon which we have been dwelling:

"'Tis the weakness in strength that I cry for!

My flesh that I seek

In the Godhead! I seek and I find it.

O Saul it shall be

A Face like my face that receives thee:

A Man like to me,

Thou shalt love and be loved by, forever!

A Hand like this hand

Shall throw open the gates of new life to thee!

See the Christ stand!"

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND.

VII.

CONTEMPORARY SOCIOLOGY.

BY PROF. A. V. HIESTER.

2. The second class of social experiments which the sociologist must study are distinguished from the first, as has been noted, by their voluntary character and limited scope. Established without governmental support or sanction, they are groups of persons who of their own motion, or under the influence of some common interest, choose to live together in one place or under one regime. Experiments of this sort are broadly called communities. As thus defined communities are not easily classified for they have existed under an almost infinite variety of form and purpose. Nevertheless, out of the bewildering medley of thought and practice two general types may be distinguished, which will be designated as coöperative and communistic.

A. COOPERATION. The word coöperation is used in a variety of senses. It may be broad enough to include all forms of associated effort from a fishing party or quilting bee, at one end of the line, to communism and socialism, at the other. In political economy, however, the word is used in a somewhat technical sense. In this restricted sense it means the ultimate substitution of solidarity for competition throughout the industrial world through the progressive elimination of certain economic classes, as the entrepreneur and middleman. This reconstruction of society is to be accomplished solely through the principle of voluntary association. Coöperation does not demand that the state shall through the government seize the instruments of production, manage all industry, and distribute the social income among the members

of society in accordance with some prescribed principle. It is precisely at this point that coöperation differs most fundamentally from socialism. And because it does not depend upon the power of the state for the accomplishment of its ends, coöperation like communism must necessarily at first be limited to small groups, whereas socialism would apply its principles simultaneously to such political and geographical aggregates as states, nations and commonwealths. While the latter would wait until the majority of such an aggregate had accepted its rule, the *modus operandi* of the former is to organize here and there small groups for industrial purposes. The manifest superiority of these groups will commend them to the world, and they will gradually extend themselves until the industrial order has been completely transformed. Nor does coöperation mean the abolition of private property. On the contrary, its aim is to make private property more general than it is, or can be, under competition. In this it differs both from socialism, which would limit the principle of private property to such forms of wealth as are not used for production, and from communism, which permits private property in nothing. Once more, while clearly recognizing the importance of capital under modern conditions of production, coöperation aims to limit its controlling power by distributing the profits of industry, not among the capitalist class as the present competitive system does, but chiefly among the laboring and consuming classes.

Coöperation was born of a desire to mitigate the evils of the present industrial order. The extreme misery of the laboring classes in Europe at the beginning of the nineteenth century, following the so-called Industrial Revolution, attracted the attention of certain social philosophers, among them Charles Fourier, in France, and Robert Owen, in England. To Owen belongs the credit of having been the first to publish a scheme of coöperative industry. The coöperation, however, which he had in mind was a communistic organization of

society rather than what is now technically known as coöperation.

Owen arrived at his communistic theories through a varied experience in business and practical philanthropy. After a service of seven years as manager of a large cotton mill at Manchester, England, to which position he had succeeded at the early age of nineteen, he became in 1797 managing partner, and, a few years later, sole proprietor, of a larger one at New Lanark, Scotland. When he came to New Lanark he saw a population sunk in ignorance, filth, vice and crime, the population, in short, of the typical English or Scotch factory town. In the mill he found about 2,000 operatives, of which not less than one fourth were charity children who had been dragged from the workhouses and bound to the proprietors through an apprenticeship system that was hardly better than slavery. The surroundings of the operatives both in the mill and in their homes were unsanitary; and the hours of labor were so long that no intermission was allowed for meals, and the employes were compelled to satisfy their hunger by snatching scraps of food while at work.

Owen addressed himself at once to the work of reform. The first thing he did was to reduce the hours of work from seventeen to ten. Then followed in rapid succession higher wages, the dismissal of children under ten years of age from the mill, the establishment of free schools, and a system of free amusements. In the schools he introduced the principle of object teaching, abolished all rewards and punishments, and endeavored to make the instruction mutual and recreative. Dancing and singing classes were provided for the young of both sexes, as well as drills for the boys and instruction in domestic economy for the girls. With the acquisition of book knowledge Owen had little patience. The supreme end of his educational, disciplinary and philanthropic agencies was the development of character. A register of character was kept for every employee, and each one's moral standing was indicated by a piece of colored wood which was placed before him

while at work. If this silent monitor was black it meant that the worker had committed an act of theft. To check drunkenness the night-watchmen took down the names of drunkards on the streets, and after a third offense an employee was liable to dismissal from the factory. A better class of homes was gradually provided. Sanitary regulations were adopted and once a week the home of every employee was visited by a committee. The cost of living was materially reduced by the establishment of a common store at which employees could purchase staple commodities at prices one fourth lower than were charged by other stores for inferior goods. To encourage thrift a savings bank was started. For those disabled by age, sickness or accident, a fund was established to which each employee was required to pay one sixtieth of his earnings.

The result of all this was the complete moral and industrial transformation of New Lanark. At the end of twelve years Owen could say that the "people of New Lanark had now become conspicuously honest, sober and orderly, and that an idle individual, one in liquor, or a thief, is scarcely to be seen from the beginning to the end of the year." From 1803 to 1819 there was not a single instance of an employee convicted for crime. The industrial results were no less striking than the moral ones. The improvement in the intelligence and physical condition of the laborers, as well as in morals, had multiplied their industrial efficiency, and at the end of four years Owen could answer the cynical sneers, with which his fellow manufacturers had watched the progress of the experiment, and the dire predictions, with which they had met every fresh reform, with the triumphant, if not convincing, statement, that despite higher wages, shorter hours, free schools and amusements, and many other philanthropic features involving a large expenditure on the part of the proprietors, a profit of £160,000 had accrued over and above an annual dividend of 5 per cent. to capital, and the selling value of the factory had been increased 50 per cent.

Owen was so well satisfied with the success of his experi-

ment at New Lanark that he began to contemplate larger schemes of social improvement. His experience had now led him to a two-fold conclusion. The first was the principle that character is determined by environment, and all that is needed to transform men is to give them proper surroundings. But this is nothing less than a denial of moral responsibility, and if carried to its logical conclusion, as it was by Owen, it must inevitably lead to the denial of the justice of private property. And this is communism. The other conclusion reached by Owen was that the working classes, for a long time at least, must be taught to help themselves by the more intelligent and more experienced members of society, more particularly the employer class as the natural guardians of the employed, and that while the masses are learning they need to be ruled with a kindly but strict paternalism. This principle that social betterment must be directed from above was fundamental in all of Owen's reformatory schemes. At New Lanark he had played the rôle of a benevolent despot. It is very probable of course that his reforms could have been accomplished in no other way. Be this as it may, Owen's experience at New Lanark gave to his mind a distinct bias towards the paternalistic principle and had an important bearing on his subsequent career.

But these two principles did not at once lead Owen to outright communism. That position was reached rather by easy stages. His first step in the direction of a larger program of social improvement was to recommend his reforms at New Lanark to other employers. But despite the favorable financial showing which he was enabled to make, and despite, too, the fact that the need of remedial measures was peculiarly urgent at the time, for the close of the Napoleonic wars and the dismissal of 200,000 soldiers had disturbed industry and greatly intensified the misery of the masses, Owen's scheme failed to commend itself to the class of large employers. Then he turned his attention to the government. In a communication to a committee of the House of Commons in 1816 he

urged the passage of a bill which should limit the hours of all factory labor to ten and a half, forbid the employment of children under ten years of age, and inaugurate a half-time system for those between ten and twelve. These suggestions, commonplace enough in the light of present-day conditions, were nothing less than revolutionary a century ago, and their prompt rejection followed as a matter of course. Nevertheless, Owen's efforts and arguments were not altogether fruitless, for two years later, and largely because of his vigorous and persistent advocacy, a factory act was placed on the statute books, which, while of little immediate value, soon proved a stepping stone to something better.

Meanwhile Owen made a second appeal to Parliament, this time in behalf of the unemployed. Before a committee headed by the Duke of Kent, and which was then considering the poor law, he argued that the state must find employment for the unemployed, and that the best way of doing this would be to form them into communities of about one thousand persons each, provide them with land and other requisites of production, and teach them to support themselves by agriculture and manufacturing. This was not yet communism for the scheme did not contain the communistic principle of distribution. In fact it said nothing at all as to the manner in which the income of these communities should be divided. The scheme was rejected like the former one, although favorably received in many quarters.

Having failed completely with the government, Owen saw no other possible way of realizing on a large scale his economic and social ideals than through the establishing of communities of voluntary associates, who would accept his views and practise his doctrines. In this effort he appealed once more to the privileged classes. In 1820 he proposed before a "general meeting of the noblemen, freeholders, justices of the peace and commissioners of supply for the shire of Lanark" the same general plan he had recommended to the Duke of Kent's committee. Its purpose was to "relieve public distress and re-

move discontent by giving permanent employment to the poor and working classes" in communities based on voluntary association but established and governed by a paternalism of privilege. Such communities, he declared, might be established "by one or any number of landed proprietors, or large capitalists; by established companies having large funds to expend for benevolent and public objects; by parishes and counties to relieve themselves from paupers; and by associations of the middle and working classes, of farmers, mechanics and tradesmen, to relieve themselves from the evils of the present system." The last alternative was clearly a concession to the democratic principle, though Owen never ceased to doubt the power of an industrial democracy to transform society.

These communities which Owen proposed now to establish were to be thoroughly communistic. That is, all property was to be held in common. The buildings were to be arranged in a parallelogram and have a common kitchen. The chief industry was to be agriculture, supplemented by such additional occupations as experience might prove advantageous. To obtain the best results Owen maintained that a community should contain not less than 300 men, women and children, and not more than 2,000. An average one, say 1,200 persons, would need from 600 to 1,800 acres of land, depending upon the degree to which it devoted itself to purely agricultural pursuits. To create a larger market for manufactures Owen proposed to substitute manual labor for horse power in the cultivation of the soil. This would have the double effect of absorbing a large proportion of the unemployed and stimulating the demand for all kinds of commodities. In all this Owen aimed at the introduction of a new principle into industrial life. He saw that through the Industrial Revolution private property had become "the privilege as profits had become the prerequisite of a strictly limited class," and he proposed to complete the work of the Revolution, which had applied the coöperative principle only to production, and

there only for the benefit of a few, by introducing it into the ownership of land and fixed capital and into the exchange of commodities, for the good of all.

The rejection of this plan by the meeting at which it was reported convinced Owen that he had nothing to expect from the large capitalists, the landed proprietors, or the local governments, and he was now clearly limited to the principle of self-established, self-governing and self-sustaining communities. But at this point he was at once confronted with the difficulty of securing the large amounts of capital which he insisted were necessary to the proper realization of his plans. An attempt was made. A joint-stock company was organized and subscriptions invited. But only a small part of the proposed capital was taken and the community was never founded. Disheartened by the failure of the scheme Owen turned his attention to America as a more promising field for the exploitation of communistic ideas. His followers who remained in Great Britain now divided into several groups. Some refused to believe that communism was an impossible ideal and attempted to practice Owen's doctrines on a more moderate scale than he had recommended. Others, clearly recognizing that the complete realization of Owen's plans was utterly impossible, contented themselves with such arrangements as were immediately practicable and would at the same time lead up to the appointed goal by easy stages. A third group gave up the goal entirely and favored the organization of joint-stock companies among the laboring classes. The result of this division of opinion was the founding of a great variety of experiments. Some were so thoroughly communistic that they divided profits equally without regard to capital invested or services rendered. In others the division was based on the estimated value of the produce of each one's labor. A third class distributed profits on the basis of capital, and were, therefore, little more than joint-stock concerns limited to the laboring classes. The majority of these experiments were of the third class. They were coöperative in

character and their aim was to realize the more moderate features of Owen's scheme. According to Holyoake, not less than 250 coöperative societies, distributive and productive, were organized in England alone between 1820 and 1830. But nearly all proved short-lived and by 1835 the movement had exhausted itself. Before coöperation could be permanently successful it was necessary that it should make a fresh start under more favorable conditions. To this new birth it attained in 1844.

The reasons why the earlier movement failed and the later one succeeded are not altogether clear. To say that conditions were more favorable to success in 1844 than in 1820 is merely stating, not solving, the problem. A closer examination of the problem will show that the earlier movement in several ways prepared the ground for the later one. Thus the earlier experiments had found an almost insuperable obstacle in the lack of adequate legal protection. This defect had been remedied by 1844. Profiting also by the mistakes of the earlier movement the later one adopted from the first a better working principle, the principle of dividing profits, not according to capital, but on the basis of purchases or labor. To these obvious advantages must be added two more, viz., that the later movement had, as the earlier one had not, the helpful sympathy and able business direction of such representatives of the educated classes as Charles Kingsley, Frederick D. Maurice, J. M. Ludlow and Thomas Hughes, and that the masses themselves had advanced in capacity and general intelligence. Between 1820 and 1844 England had made rapid strides towards democracy, and it is not too much to say that the effects of the reforms of 1832, and the period of agitation by which they were preceded, were profoundly felt throughout the social fabric. Coöperation is in essence a democratic movement. The virtues which it needs for success are the virtues of democracy, and it is easy to believe that it must have benefited greatly by the new life which the growing spirit of democracy imparted to the entire nation.

After 1844 the coöperative movement assumed three distinct forms, which, while proceeding from the same general principle, have developed more or less independently. These several forms are known as (a) Distributive Coöperation, (b) Productive Coöperation, and (c) Coöperative Banking.

(a) A coöperative society for distribution is nothing more than an association of consumers whose aim is the elimination of the middleman and the distribution of his profits among themselves, sometimes according to capital, but more generally according to purchases. This form of coöperation has achieved its greatest success in England. It began in 1844 when the "Rochdale Society of Equitable Pioneers" was organized for the sale of groceries with a membership of twenty-eight, mostly weavers, a capital of £28 and a weekly trade of £2. At first the store was open only two nights a week and the members took turns in waiting on the customers. After paying the expenses of management and a fixed interest on the capital the net profits were divided quarterly among the members in proportion to their respective purchases. This was changed a little later by the provision that the profits should be withheld regularly until each member held five £1 shares. In this way any one could become a capitalist and stockholder simply by trading at the store and paying a small membership fee. To make it impossible for a few stockholders to control the store by means of large holdings of stock, the ultra-democratic principle was adopted of giving to each member but one vote regardless of the number of shares which he held.

The Rochdale society was a success from the beginning. At the end of the first year its membership had increased to seventy-four and its capital to £181. At present it has 12,000 members and a capital of £400,000. From Rochdale the principles of distributive coöperation spread rapidly over England and Scotland. In 1901 there were in these two countries nearly 2,000 societies owning and conducting coöperative stores, with a membership of 1,800,000, an accumulated

capital of £22,000,000, an annual trade of £50,000,000, and an annual net profit of £5,000,000. Some of these societies are very large, a number having as many as 30,000 members, while the Leeds society does an annual business of £1,000,000.

In the larger societies a fixed percentage of the profits is devoted to libraries, lectures and other educational features. The Rochdale society is an excellent illustration of this for it has not only a most complete library, astronomical instruments and a chemical laboratory in connection with its principal store, but also branch libraries and reading rooms at its branch stores.

On this gigantic retail system three additional coöperative features have been grafted at various times. The first to be adopted was wholesale trading, the English Wholesale Society being organized in 1864, and the Scotch Wholesale Society a few years later. Both are simply federations of the retail stores. They are conducted on precisely the same principles as the retail stores, and their purpose is to secure by collective purchasing better terms from jobbers and manufacturers than the retail stores could obtain for themselves. Their government is vested in a general committee elected by ballot by delegates appointed by the retail societies in the proportion of one delegate to five hundred members. The capital of the wholesale societies is held exclusively by the retail societies which compose their membership, each one being required to take up one £5 share for every ten members. They sell at a profit and divide the net profits among their members in proportion to purchases. Like most retail stores, too, they allow to non-shareholding purchasers one half the dividends paid to shareholders. These wholesale societies have not only been eminently successful themselves, but they have greatly strengthened the retail movement by the support which they have given to the weaker stores and the helpful counsel and business direction which they have given to all. In 1901 the English society had a membership of over 1,000 retail stores, a capital of £2,500,000 and a net profit of £335,000.

It maintains purchasing agencies in all the important supply centers of the world and owns and operates a line of steamers for its own needs.

The other two coöperative features grafted on the retail movement are banking and production. Both are now conducted by the wholesale societies as the agents of the retail stores. In banking the net profits are divided on the basis of both debits and credits. The field of production has been entered largely because of the difficulty of finding in wholesaling profitable employment for the large capitals of the wholesale societies. The English society now manufactures a considerable variety of standard commodities, such as flour, biscuits, sweets, soap, cloth, ready-made clothing, leather and shoes. It is said to operate the largest shoe factory in the world. It also engages in building, printing and farming and is gradually covering the whole field of consumption, although 95 per cent. of English coöperation is still of the distributive sort.

In the United States coöperative stores though frequently attempted have rarely been successful for the following reasons:

1. Coöperative stores, like coöperative factories, have been attempted chiefly in connection with labor organizations, such as the Patrons of Husbandry, the Sovereigns of Industry and the Knights of Labor, and when these organizations declined their coöperative ventures failed as a matter of course.

2. All forms of coöperation require a certain homogeneity of thought and feeling and this has been less developed in the United States than in most other countries.

3. Coöperation, and particularly the distributive sort, requires a readiness to take a good deal of trouble for the sake of petty economies, and has not, therefore, appealed strongly to the open-handed and improvident American workman.

4. Coöperative stores in the United States have been unable generally to compete with the large department stores, or even with the smaller ones. In England, on the other hand, de-

partment stores are unknown, while the English stores generally are of a distinctly inferior type to those found in the United States.

5. In the United States coöperative ventures have been sporadic in character. There has been no common organization to bind them together and each has stood in more or less complete isolation. The importance of such a bond is seen in England where coöperation did not become permanently successful until a central organization had been formed.

(b) Productive coöperation from the necessities of the case has been less successful than the distributive sort, for the production of commodities is obviously less simple under modern conditions and makes a greater demand on capital and business enterprise. The specific purpose of this form of coöperative effort is to eliminate the entrepreneur and bring productive industry under the direction either of the laborers or of the consumers. With respect to the latter point there are two schools of opinion, the individualists and the federalists. The former hold that groups of workmen ought to establish productive enterprises for themselves, managing them either through one or more of their own number or through a hired manager, obtaining the necessary capital either from their own savings or by loans, and having no connection with the consumers' societies. The federalists maintain on the contrary that production ought to be controlled by the federated stores in the interest, not of the producers, but of the consumers. They argue that productive enterprises established in accordance with the individualist principle would of necessity enter into competition with one another and thus lose part of their coöperative character; that individualist enterprises would experience difficulty in securing the necessary capital among the workmen, and if outside shareholders should be admitted in order to secure capital, then there would be the same jealousies between labor and capital as in competitive industry, and such enterprises would again lose part of their

coöperative character; that individualist enterprises would be further embarrassed by the difficulty of securing and retaining competent managers, for managers taken from the ranks of labor would not ordinarily possess the requisite capacity, training and experience, while efficient managers hired from the outside, could not be retained because of inadequate salaries. To these arguments the individualists reply that by excluding individual stockholders from productive enterprises and securing the necessary capital from the federated stores the federalist principle would, if strictly adhered to, limit the benefits of productive coöperation to the consumers. So far as the producers are concerned this is not coöperation at all. To remedy this injustice some federalists advocate a bonus on labor. The effect of this would be to divide the benefits of coöperation between the producers and the consumers. The Scottish Wholesale Society is conducted on this principle but in the English society the other principle rules.

In England and Scotland productive coöperation is chiefly of the federalist type, but elsewhere it has followed the individualist principle for the reason that outside Great Britain distributive coöperation has had little permanent success. The individualist principle has succeeded best in France where there were in 1902 no less than 323 societies for production, some of them very prosperous. The most celebrated one is the "Maison Leclaire" at Paris. Edmé Jean Leclaire was a Parisian housepainter and decorator who in 1842 introduced into his business the principle of profit-sharing with the most gratifying results. His long experience as an employer had led him to the conclusion that there are in the common workman "moral qualities to which the simple wage system makes slight appeal because it leaves the inspired word profit, with all its implications of ambition, zeal and persistence, out of the workman's vocabulary." As soon as the success of the experiment was assured and his contention justified that a bonus to wages is not only a benefit to the laborer but a profitable thing for the employer as well, Leclaire

gradually withdrew from active participation in the conduct of the business; and in 1865 he withdrew altogether after effecting a re-organization which placed the control of the business entirely in the hands of the workmen.

According to the present constitution of the society there are two managing partners and one sleeping partner. The latter is the Mutual Aid Society. The capital is 400,000 francs of which the sleeping partner holds one half and each of the managing partners one fourth. To meet all emergencies a reserve fund of 100,000 francs is maintained. At the end of the year the first claimant on the profits of the society is the reserve fund, which, if it has been impaired during the year, is entitled to an amount not exceeding 10 per cent. of the gross profits. As a matter of fact, however, it has never happened that the fund has been drawn upon to meet losses. Then after the payment of 5 per cent. interest on the capital, and a salary of 1,200 francs to each of the managing partners for superintendence, the net profits are divided as follows: One fourth goes to the managing partners in the proportion of two parts to the senior partner and one to the junior; one fourth goes to the Mutual Aid Society; and the remainder is distributed among the employees of the house in proportion to wages and salaries. It will be recognized that this is something more than profit-sharing for the workmen exercise at least an indirect control over the business, which is not at all the case in profit-sharing. This control is exercised through two representative bodies, the Committee of Conciliation and the *Noyau*. Membership in the *Noyau* depends wholly on personal merit and is limited to skilled workmen of French birth who are able to read and cipher, who are of good moral character particularly in the domestic relations, and who have been in the employ of the house not less than five years. The *Noyau* represents the workmen in all matters of joint administration. It also elects the managing partners and the Committee of Conciliation. The latter body is composed of the managing partners and eight representatives

of the workmen. Its functions are chiefly disciplinary. It dismisses, suspends and warns delinquent workmen, examines applicants for employment and nominates the managing partners. To make it possible for any one who has ability and character to rise to the position of managing partner, the constitution provides that if the new partner does not have the necessary capital, that is, one fourth of the whole, the heirs of his deceased predecessor must leave his capital, or so much as may be needed, in the society until the new partner is able to replace it out of his share of the profits. It is worth noting, too, that in the choice of the managing partners, overseers and other administrative agencies, the *Noyau* has exhibited rare good sense.

The Mutual Aid Society, as its name indicates, is a beneficiary, not an administrative body. Its membership is limited to members of the *Noyau* in good health and of good constitution, and its function is to aid the sick and provide death benefits. A sick member receives $2\frac{1}{2}$ francs for every day he is unable to work. Every member who is over fifty years of age and has worked for the house not less than twenty years is entitled to a retiring pension of 1,500 francs. At death, besides his funeral expenses, an insurance policy of 1,000 francs is paid to his family, and half his annual pension is continued to his widow for life, or to his children as long as there is a daughter under twenty-one years of age or a son under seventeen. All employees, whether members of the Mutual Aid Society or not, who are permanently disabled while at work, are entitled to a full retiring pension.

That the "Maison Leclaire" has been a great economic blessing is beyond question. While paying the highest rate of wages current in the market its bonus on wages has averaged for a number of years 20 per cent. But great as have been its economic benefits its moral benefits have been even greater. It has been a school of industry, honesty, sobriety, thrift, self-respect and common kindness, and it has made model workmen out of men who as a class have been "notori-

ously the most dilatory, intemperate, debauched and intractable workmen to be found in Paris." Its moral and economic worth is attested by its own growth and by the fact that in Paris alone seventy firms have adopted its principles.

In the United States productive coöperation has had even less success than the distributive kind. Between 1870 and 1880 the coöperative principle was introduced into such industries as printing, tanning, building and the making of shoes, furniture, gas, cotton goods, cigars, clothing and glass. In 1876 the Patrons of Husbandry reported thirty manufacturing enterprises in existence, all of which have since failed. Probably the most successful instance of productive coöperation in the United States is to be found among the coopers of Minneapolis. Between 1874 and 1886 nine coöperative concerns were established. These concerns include now about two thirds of the coopers in that great milling center and their annual output is over \$1,000,000. All are purely coöperative in plan and operation, for in each the capital stock is held by the workmen, each shareholder has but one vote, the market rate of wages is paid to labor and the market rate of interest to capital, and the net profits are divided in proportion to wages.

For the limited success which has thus far attended productive coöperation everywhere various reasons may be given. Some of these reasons have obviously less weight against the federalist principle. The most important are the following:

1. *The Difficulty of Securing and Retaining Efficient Managers.*—This is a real difficulty, often indeed a fatal one, and has been referred to in connection with the issue between the individualist and federalist principles. The sociologist will not fail to recognize that while the success of the "Maison Leclaire" must be attributed in no slight degree to the masterful personality of its founder, his extraordinary business capacity, his rare insight into human nature, and his marvelous power to impress others with his own purposes and ideals, his scheme possessed a unique intrinsic worth for it approached

productive coöperation through a long preliminary period of moral discipline and economic training, in the course of which a successful employer gradually withdrew from the leadership of an enterprise and thereby enabled his employees to become, first, partners with him and later his successors. This mode of approach, and the peculiar internal economy to which it naturally leads, offers the best solution of the problem of coöperative management yet made, for it combines the business talent, the enterprise, training, experience and zeal of the managing partner with the fidelity, economy and industry of interested workmen.

The federalist principle would solve this problem of management by placing production under the control of federated stores which would provide capable managers and pay them adequate salaries. This would undoubtedly insure a better class of managers than would be possible ordinarily under the individualist principle. For a group of laborers more or less isolated from other groups would necessarily be confined to narrower limits in choosing a manager, and even within these limits it could not be trusted, without long experience and better economic education, to make the wisest choice or retain a capable manager when once secured.

2. *Lack of Industrial Capital.*—The laborer cannot ordinarily afford to wait indefinitely for an uncertain profit. However large the profit may prove in the end, he must have a more or less regular wage and for this capital is needed. Capital is needed, too, to secure the economies of large-scale production without which the coöperative enterprise cannot hope to enter into successful competition with its rivals. The federalist principle, again, would meet this difficulty, in part at least, by providing all necessary capital from the federated stores.

3. *Lack of Moral Capital.*—Productive coöperation has largely failed because it demands more than ordinary moral qualities. When selfishness, insubordination and mutual distrust dominate an enterprise the inevitable tendency is to

reestablish the very institutions which coöperation professes to eliminate, viz. the entrepreneur class and the wage system. This is seen when a successful coöperative enterprise closes its doors to new members. In such a case the usual outcome is a joint-stock concern in which the original members own all the capital and hire such additional members as they may need. An excellent illustration of this is furnished by a Parisian coöperative society of spectacle makers which has fifty members and 1,200 employees working for wages. Successful the enterprise has been beyond the shadow of a doubt for the value of a share of stock has increased from \$60 to \$10,000. But this is not coöperation. It failed as a coöperative enterprise for the simple reason that its members lost or never had the coöperative spirit. It is nothing more than a joint-stock company. Human nature being what it is, this tendency to degenerate into joint-stockism is a standing menace to every successful coöperative concern.

(c) The lack of capital which so frequently has proved fatal to both productive and distributive coöperation has prompted the third form of coöperative effort. Here Germany has led the way with its Schulze-Delitzsch coöperative banks and Raiffeisen loan banks, so named from their respective founders. The former are associations of laborers, artisans and small tradesmen organized for the double purpose of investing the small savings of their members, and making loans to members on such security as wages due, merchandise or chattels. If the accumulated capital and membership dues are insufficient to meet the demand for loans on the part of the members money is borrowed from the outside. Such loans are secured by the unlimited liability of all the members, and are therefore obtainable on better terms than any one could possibly secure by pledging his individual credit. In this way small tradesmen and producers are materially assisted in maintaining themselves in competition with large trading and manufacturing establishments.

The Raiffeisen loan banks differ from the Schulze-Delitzsch

coöperative banks only in details and methods. While the latter emphasize the lender's interest, pay high dividends on capital, charge high rates of interest, have salaried officials and are open to all classes, the former limit their benefits to the agricultural classes, put the interest of the borrower foremost, charge low rates of interest, pay no dividends, have no capital stock, membership dues or salaried officials, and devote their profits to charity, public works or other social benefits.

This form of coöperation began in 1849 in Germany. At first little progress was made, but since 1860 the movement has spread rapidly over Germany and Italy. In 1901 there were in the former 949 coöperative and loan banks, of which number 870 reported 511,000 members, a capital of \$200,000,000 and an annual profit of \$3,000,000. The loans amounted to \$575,000,000 with a total loss of only one twentieth of one per cent.

In the United States and England coöperative banks take the form of building and loan associations and in both countries they have been highly successful. In England there are now 2,500 associations with aggregate assets of \$300,000,000. In the United States the number is over 6,000 with 2,000,000 shareholders and assets of \$450,000,000. A building and loan association does not differ materially from a coöperative bank of the Schulze-Delitzsch pattern. Both are strong incentives to thrift and both make it possible to save in the easiest way, that is, through the regular payment of small amounts. The chief difference between the two is that the primary purpose of a building and loan association is to enable its members to buy or build homes, and that its loans are secured by real estate mortgages or by the borrower's shares as collateral. It does not make loans on such security as wages due, merchandise or chattels, nor does it employ its collective credit to borrow money from outside capitalists and loan it to its members.

It will be seen now from this cursory study that while coöperation of the distributive and credit sorts has been suc-

cessful, the former in England, the latter in Germany, Italy, England and the United States, productive coöperation has utterly failed to realize the expectations of its early advocates, and that with human nature as it is, this form of coöperative effort offers no immediately practicable escape from modern industrial evils, more particularly the wage system. When Jannet, a Frenchman and not an apostle of coöperation, declared that coöperation "is the only social experiment of the nineteenth century that has been successful," he could not have had in mind productive coöperation, for productive coöperation has failed almost everywhere. It has been before its time and it must await a higher ethical development on the part of the masses to become permanently and generally successful. And meanwhile the other forms of coöperation will train the laboring classes in prudence, thrift, business capacity, mutual respect and helpfulness, and the ability to act together for a common end.

VIII.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT.

LEARNING VS. EDUCATION.

There is an old saying to the effect that a man may learn much and yet never become wise. This is but another way of saying that the amount of knowledge which a man acquires may be of little use to him who acquires it if it is not properly organized and if it does not discipline the mind of him who possesses it so that he becomes capable of acting in this busy world and of bringing all his resources to bear upon any difficult problem. In fact, knowledge may be useless rubbish; and with all our getting, as long as we do not get wisdom, we may be but poorly equipped for life. We boast in these days of the progress which we have made in education, progress in the expansion of the field of knowledge, progress in the extent to which the different branches of knowledge have been developed, and progress in our methods of instruction. And yet it may be questioned whether we are any further on in the making of educated men and women than our forefathers were. If we compare the curriculum of Harvard University with the curriculum of the same institution as it was in the year of grace 1800, we see a remarkable advance; but it is not so certain that the men who are graduated from Harvard University to-day are stronger men, enjoy happier lives and wield a greater influence in the community than the men who received their degrees in the long ago. It is beginning to be generally felt that "all is not gold that glitters" and there are heard on every side voices of criticism of our educational methods, coming very often from quarters where they were least expected, and touching features in our educational sys-

tem which a few years ago were the occasion of much pride and boastful felicitation. In view of these facts, it may be well to inquire whether in our endeavors to teach and to learn we have not, to some extent, forgotten what it is to educate.

At the late meeting of the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland held at the College of the City of New York, the President of the Association, Dr. Woodrow Wilson, President of Princeton University, made the following statement: "You know perfectly well what the result has been (i. e., of experimentation upon the basis of pedagogical theories); you know that the children of the past two or three decades have not been educated. You know that the pupils in the colleges in the last several decades have not been educated. You know that with all our teaching we train nobody; you know that with all our instructing we educate nobody. I say you know this, not meaning that you will admit it in a public discussion, but that when you are alone upon your knees at night you would feel obliged to confess it. I have had the experience (which I am sure is common to modern teachers) of feeling that I was spending all my efforts to do a thing which was not susceptible of being done, and that the teaching that I professed to do was as if done in a vacuum, as if done without a transmitting medium, as if done without an atmosphere in which the forces could be transmitted. I am not indicting other persons any more than I am indicting myself. I have been teaching now for nearly twenty years, I have been conducting classroom exercises for nearly twenty years; and I don't think I have been teaching any appreciable portion of that time. I have been delivering lectures which I meant to be interesting, I have been saying things some of which I knew; I have been repeating other things—many other things—which I have heard. I have been putting together views of knowledge much more systematic than my own investigations warranted me in putting together; and the result has been that my pupils have,

for the most part, remembered my stories and forgotten my lectures." Of course, President Wilson did not mean to have his words taken literally. He exaggerated the evils of our present systems of education for the purpose of calling attention to the necessity of a reformation. He says the period through which we have passed has been a period of analysis and dispersion. Now we are on the eve of a period of synthesis and reconstruction. The importance of such a process is beginning to be felt by educators generally; and it is with no little satisfaction that those who have held conservative views in education, who have felt that education was the making of men and women as they should be, fit to hold in their hands the destinies of our land under the complex forms of civilization which prevail to-day, see the turn of the tide and the return to a recognition of the difference between diversified modes of acquiring knowledge, and a genuine process of intellectual and moral development.

It goes without saying that the principle assumed here, that education means the harmonious development of all the powers and faculties of our human life, does not for a moment detract from the importance of the acquisition of knowledge, of the differentiation of various departments and modes of investigation, or of the progressive advancement of knowledge in every direction and to any extent that scientific investigation can reach. There is room for that, and he who would forego the privilege of getting the best that thorough investigation and close study can furnish in every department of life is better fitted for a career in the thirteenth century than for one in the twentieth. Criticism of our educational methods does not mean the undervaluation of university training, of specialization to any degree that may be required, and the fearless pursuit of truth, wherever truth may lead. But it does mean a weighing in the balance of the claims sometimes put forth that it does not matter what a boy or girl, a young man or young woman may study, or the thought that such a one is competent

in school or college to choose what course of study may be most advantageously pursued. "By their fruits ye shall know them." It is these fruits especially that are opening the eyes of educators and of thoughtful men generally to the evils which follow in the train of the methods now so largely in vogue.

In the first place, the effort to cover the whole field of available knowledge, to burden the pupils in our public schools or the students of our colleges with too many studies, will, in the nature of the case, produce superficiality and shallowness, affording a smattering of knowledge, bits of information here and there without thorough assimilation or the proper connection or correlation of the different departments of knowledge. On the other hand, excessive specialization and the pursuit of only such branches of knowledge as are supposed to fit the student immediately for some practical pursuit, or even a profession, produces narrowness and utter incompetency, or helplessness outside of the sphere to which the individual has specially devoted himself. It is not true that the mind is equally disciplined by bestowing the same amount of labor upon one or a few branches of study that would result from the pursuit of a larger number of properly related and coördinated subjects. Professor Bagley in his work on "The Educative Process" quotes Professors Thorndyke, Woodworth and O'Shea to the effect that all the evidence obtained by careful observation upon a large number of pupils goes to prove that *formal training is not generalized*. That is to say, the careful, painstaking training in one branch does not produce a corresponding improvement or facility in other branches of work. For instance, careful experiments were undertaken to determine whether the habit of producing neat papers in arithmetic would produce neat written work in other studies. "The results are almost startling in their failure to show the slightest improvement in language and spelling papers, although the improvement in arithmetic papers was noticeable

from the very first" (page 208). In the same way it has been shown that industry in one line of work will not necessarily produce industry in other lines of work. The only appreciable effect of forming a good habit in a particular line of work is that it tends to form a higher ideal of work, and that may help to achieve excellence in other departments, but not without study in those particular directions. If modern pedagogy has established anything, therefore, it has established the fact that a true education requires a broad culture, that there must be a harmonious development of the leading powers of the mind in school and college before the student is prepared to take up the narrower studies of a profession or the extreme specialization of the scientific student who pursues his original investigation for the purpose of extending the domain of knowledge. In addition to this, and this point is of even greater importance, the forming of character, the making of the man or woman in the proper sense of the word, the realization of a type of human life corresponding measurably to the lofty ideal of our divine Lord and Master is of more account even than the acquisition of knowledge or the discipline of the mental faculties.

As over against such broad culture, the narrow specialization to which a student devotes himself in advanced graduate work tends to narrow his horizon and to concentrate his interest upon the special subject pursued. This is the case to some extent even if such special training has been preceded by a course of liberal study; but it is especially true in cases where under the extreme elective system, the whole development and training of the student has been in a certain definite line. Such specialization fits a man for the making of original investigations, the extension of knowledge, or even the teaching of students on advanced lines in special branches of study; but experience proves the statement made above, and it has been found accordingly that university trained men, men who have become narrow specialists in their departments are not by any

means the best teachers in secondary schools and colleges. On this point Prof. Thomas M. Balliet, Dean of the School of Pedagogy in New York University, says: "The highly specialized training of the best graduate schools seems to make it difficult for the young teacher to view his work from the standpoint of his pupils rather than from that of his subject. It is absolutely necessary that the chief interest of the teacher in a secondary school be in his pupils rather than in his subject; and the perennial source of interest in secondary school work must be in the new problems which each new class, and, indeed, each new pupil, presents, more than in any researches which the teacher has the time and strength to make in his special field. A teacher in a secondary school whose deepest interest is in his subject will find, after a series of years, secondary school work exceedingly disappointing and uninteresting. Such work is altogether too elementary to be a source of inspiration from the standpoint of scholarship, and it is altogether too taxing on one's strength, because of its amount, to make it possible privately to pursue one's specialty in its higher departments. A teacher who is required to teach Latin or mathematics for five hours during the day is not likely to read Tacitus or study the calculus in the evening for pleasure. In short, in the secondary school, as in the elementary school, the teacher's interest must be in his pupil more than in his subject, and it would be well if this were more the case in our colleges than it is; while in the university, where the student is mature and is prepared for advanced specialized study, the interest of the teacher may well be chiefly in his subject."

By parity of reasoning we infer that the minister of the Gospel who is best versed in theology is not necessarily the best preacher or the best pastor. Here, too, there may be an interest in particular aspects of the science of theology to such an extent that interest in human souls and a healthy religious development becomes a secondary matter. But, ought not

progress to be made in the scientific development of theological truth as well as in all other lines of human inquiry? Certainly. The truths of God revealed to man, the religious experiences of mankind, the questions connected with and rising from a living, growing church and the life of God in the heart of the believer, have not received their full answer, or their final development. There is abundant room for scientific study and investigation along all these lines; and the minister of the Gospel, of course, ought to know in a general way what the trend of thought is on all these subjects. But there is a difference between the university and the theological seminary. There is a difference between those who are fearlessly in search of the truth and claim for themselves "*Lehr-Freiheit*" and those who are appointed to train young men for the Gospel ministry. Men in the latter position must be in broad sympathy with the wholeness of Christian life, with the training of children, the education of the youth, the edification of a Christian congregation, the conversion of the world to Christ. Their work is positive rather than negative and it can be carried forward in any department only by being in broad sympathy with the work in all other departments. The same is true in the preaching of the Gospel. The minister is in part a teacher, and his office is not that of a specialist. It is undoubtedly true both in teaching and in preaching that a man cannot know too much to be a good teacher, provided his knowing does not make him one-sided and narrow. The large heart, the generous spirit, the universal human interest are required in all who would be true educators. Those who simply aspire to learning, or to assist others in learning may perhaps dispense with such interest; but in the proper work of education, that is, in the making of mind and heart, the development of intellect and character, surely such breadth of character is necessary.

If these principles are correct, it follows that a course of liberal education must include a sufficient number of studies

to secure a harmonious development of the human powers and to beget a broad sympathy with the life of the age in which we live. Dr. Wilson says it ought to include science, literature, including language, philosophy, and history. Each of these covers a broad field and would it be vain to strive after a complete mastery of each field? The motto of the teacher in the public school, the secondary school, and the college ought to be: "Much rather than many things." The outcome of such training ought to be a fair knowledge of what these departments involve, a fairly thorough knowledge of some particular discipline in each department, ability to study and to take up the pursuit of independent work along these different lines, and the development of a healthy, well-rounded character grounded in the principles of truth and honesty, and inspired with zeal and enthusiasm to take up the work of life. The knowledge which a man gains is useful to him and a source of power; but a man is not educated in the proper sense of the word until he is capable in any emergency to bring all his resources to bear upon the question at issue, and to conduct himself with manliness and independence in the most trying crises that may confront him. Perhaps I cannot express these thoughts better than by again quoting from Dr. Wilson: "The majority of our youth must be given an exact and thorough technical training. That is one of the things this age needs; and if you count heads, it is the main thing that this age needs. But in education we don't count heads: that is to say, we don't count the outsides of them. There is another sort of education which this age needs more than any preceding age; that kind which for many ages has borne amongst us the name of liberal education. If ever an age stood in need of men capable of seeing the invisible things, it is the age in which we live. If ever an age stood in need of the statesmanship of mind, this is that age; if ever an age stood in need of men lifted a little above their fellows in their point of view, who can see the significance of knowledge and

of affairs, this is the age. If our great army of workers is to be left to work with their gaze concentrated upon the task, and there is no one to see visions, no one to order the field, no one to organize the great functions of mind and of organized effort of which we stand in need every day—why, then, we shall stumble upon immediate disaster. We are in need as no age ever was of liberal education; there are so many things coördinate in our thinking that we sadly stand in need of thinkers."

J. S. S.

IX.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

THE INWARD LIGHT. By H. Fielding Hall. New York, The Macmillan Company. Pages 228. Price \$1.75 net.

The author of this book is an Englishman who has resided many years in Burma and is evidently in genuine sympathy with oriental life and thought. He is, moreover, a poet and a mystic who puts before us in glowing colors the changing panorama of oriental scenery and the shifting aspects of human life as only a poet and mystic can paint them. When he comes to their interpretation, however, notwithstanding the beauty and force of his representations, it soon becomes apparent that his enthusiasm makes him read into Buddhism more than the calm investigator is likely to find, and attribute to Christianity and Western thought beliefs and doctrines which no rational adherent of either would for a moment be willing to entertain.

Buddhism is, in these days, attracting a great deal of attention, as is evident from the fact that three international societies for the propagation of the faith have recently been established. For this reason an exposition of Buddhist doctrine, such as is contained in this volume, is not without interest; besides, there are a charm and beauty in the picture, if one has a little patience, and there are many striking truths, if one has a little power to sift and weigh them, which will well repay perusal and careful study.

The underlying thought of the book is the idea of evolution. This, the author says, the Western world has discovered as a scientific fact in the material world; the Eastern world has held it for thousands of years as a fundamental law of the spiritual world. The West has learned that man's body is derived from lower forms of life by a process of evolution; the East knows that man's soul is derived in the same way through a series of changes, migrating from state to state, now higher, now lower, according to the deeds done in each state, making for itself a body corresponding to its moral condition, in a continuous process until it reaches perfection in Nirvana and is absorbed again in the Universal Life from which it had its beginning. All life is one, all truth is one; but there are endless phases of each, important, yea, essential, although but partial, for any particular stage of development, and preparing the way for the next higher form if properly used, or falling back to a lower if abused or disregarded. Memory belongs only to the body and ends, therefore, in each

case with death; but the moral quality of the life itself is carried forward, and whatever the condition may be it is simply the fruit of an earlier life in a previous incarnation. If a man suffers he may be sure that he deserves it; if he is prosperous and happy he has earned it; and the life he now lives will determine what his future will be.

This fundamental thought is illustrated by means of numerous facts and phenomena of the physical world. The all-pervading wind blowing here and there and everywhere is a symbol of the all-pervading life. The water rising in the form of moisture from river, lake, and ocean, concentrated in rain and snow, forming rills, brooks, and rivers until it finds its way back into the mighty ocean to become a part of the great mass illustrates the process by which life comes from its primal source, passes through the various forms of phenomenal existence, and returns to be reunited with the vast whole from which it proceeded and of which all the time it was a part. The ray of white light, decomposed by the prism, appears in the form of separate rays of different colors and is thus the analogon of different forms of life, which, in the end, will coalesce and form again the perfect unity of a single existence which embodies all the different forms in absolute harmony. Such illustrations are beautiful and not without force. But they do not tell us, and the author does not tell us how the transition from the absolute to the phenomenal is mediated, or how the moral quality passes from one form of life to another. We know something of the genesis of the body, and we can understand, in a measure at least, the principle of heredity; but it is not easy to see how a migrating soul should find or make for itself the precise body that will fit its moral condition, when such bodies are the product of a series of natural forces in continuous operation, and the indwelling souls partake of the qualities of both immediate and remote ancestors.

The author claims for Buddhism and its followers in Burma a degree of sympathy with nature, contentment in the changing vicissitudes of life, submission to the requirements of the moral law, and hope for a blissful immortality with consequent peace and happiness such as no other form of religion can give. On the other hand, he charges the West with always saying to itself: "that if a man say he believe in God, Right, Wrong, Hell, Heaven—things which no one can define or express—it does not matter what his acts are. So you get Popes and Bishops who murdered, warred, and committed every wickedness; so you get men now who go to teach the 'Heathen' of another world, and spend their time trading and governing in this" (p. 155). Any one who is at all acquainted with life in the East cannot fail to see that the claim for Buddhism is as far removed from the reality of condi-

tions there, as the charge brought against the West fails to give a correct representation of rational Christianity anywhere. After all, Buddhism offers only submission to what is instead of faith in a Personal God who is at the same time a tender and loving Father and it looks forward to an immortality of oneness "with all the beauty of the world, with the sunshine on the hills, the majesty of the night, the laughter of the waters: with the nobility of noble deeds; the souls of all whom we have loved; with the great Power which is all life" (p. 199), instead of the infinite worth of conscious personal existence in the image and likeness of our divine Lord and Master, the bloom and perfection of ideal manhood.

JOHN S. STAHR.

LUTHER'S CATECHETICAL WRITINGS; God's Call to Repentance, Faith and Prayer, the Bible Plan of Salvation Explained by Luther. Translated, with the Help of Others, by Professor John Nicholas Lenker, D.D. Vol. I., pages 377. Price \$1.65. The Luther Press, Minneapolis, Minn., U. S. A. 1907.

In previous numbers of the REVIEW we have published notices of the several volumes containing the translation of Luther's Sermons on the Gospels. This volume belongs to the same general series, entitled, "The Standard Edition of Luther's Works in English." It includes the following notable writings of the great Reformer: Luther's Small Catechism; Luther's Large Catechism; The Law, Faith and Prayer; The Three Universal Creeds; The Lord's Prayer Explained; Sermon on Holy Baptism; Instruction on Confession; Benefits of the Lord's Supper. In a Foreword of 15 pages the Editor defines the educational views of Luther, who in this regard was in substantial agreement with Melancthon, the præceptor of Germany. "In his (Luther's) pedagogical writings he had in mind a comprehensive system of education: (1) the primary schools, (2) the secondary schools and (3) the universities. 'In schools of all kinds,' he says, 'the chief and most common lesson should be in the Scriptures.'" The Foreword, also, contains a brief history of the catechisms, and a new outline of Christian Pedagogy and Reading. The latter is divided into seven grades, each of which is adjusted to the age of the pupil and all are based on Luther's Catechisms and his other writings, the Bible, and supplementary readings in Church history. These tables of readings are appended to a number of sections of this volume, and are intended to guide the reader into a general study of Luther's religious doctrines as expounded in his writings. The aim of Dr. Lenker evidently is to revive interest in Luther in the laymen of the Lutheran churches by bringing them into immediate touch with his writings. How far this can be done in the way proposed remains to be seen.

We heartily agree, however, with the Editor, who also expresses the opinion of Luther, that Christians need a summary of Biblical truth, both to guide them in teaching children and to aid them in understanding the Bible as a whole. The average mind cannot comprehend the Scriptures without a concise abstract of its principal doctrines. The reformers recognized this fact and prepared catechisms and confessions, not indeed to supersede the Bible but as aids to understand it. Whether men are willing to accept the sixteenth century Catechisms for modern use or not, the principle that a comprehensive summary of some kind is indispensable for popular instruction is still pedagogically sound.

Since the American churches have for more than a century forsaken the educational system of religion and have largely surrendered their heritage to Methodistic revivalism, we consider this publication most timely. It sets forth clearly the interdependence of religion and education. Christianity is to appeal to the intellect and conscience, and to mold the mind and heart. It is not a mere momentary experience, a passing ecstasy, or a sporadic emotion. It is a life which is begotten by the Spirit of God through His Word. It is nourished by Christian instruction in the home, the school, and the congregation. It is sustained by the sacraments and Christian fellowship. In this way only will the churches develop a normal Christian manhood, increase the number and holiness of their members, and extend their borders to the ends of the earth.

Many of the principles of religious pedagogy, which are now proclaimed as new discoveries, are only rediscoveries of original protestant ideals which were held alike by the reformers of the Lutheran and Reformed churches. While no one will deny that great progress has been made in the understanding of the child mind and in the preparation of juvenile literature, we must not forget that the Reformers were the fathers of these movements. In a sense we can go forward only by going backward to their principles, though we would not be forever bound by their forms.

This book does not belong simply to the Lutherans. Every intelligent protestant will take an interest in it. The teacher who is primarily concerned about methods, the historian who seeks to know the religious ideas of Luther, the preacher who desires a popular and an authoritative exposition of the Commandments, the Creeds, the Lord's Prayer, and the Sacraments, the theological student who would become acquainted with the genius and doctrines of the Reformer by reading the sources—all these will find what they want in this volume and cannot afford to be ignorant of its contents.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY. By S. S. HEBERD. Revised Edition. Pages 307. Price \$1.50. New York, Maspeth Publishing House, 76 Milton St., Borough of Queens. 1908.

In this period of specialism and analysis few men are bold enough to attempt to write a philosophy of history. Books of this kind were prepared by the synthetic minds of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. But so extensive is the material, so complex are the tendencies, and so difficult are the problems of universal history, that a philosophic exposition of it is received with suspicion. The author of this volume is comparatively an unknown person. He has neither office nor title, and the reader, at first sight of the book, is inclined to think that it does not deserve scholarly recognition. If it had the imprint of Berlin or Oxford on its title-page it would command immediate attention. The author himself feels that "the book is heavily handicapped by the very grandeur of its pretensions." He boldly criticises Hume and Kant, and presents his own theory of knowledge. He claims to be a pioneer. The "many inductions, reaching over so vast and varied a field, have not been tested by the criticism of friend or foe." After reading a few pages one is captivated by the simplicity, the directness, and the penetration of the author. He makes you think. Whether you agree with him or not, you cannot deny that you are confronted by a man who has read widely, pondered his material carefully, and thought clearly. The work deserves far more popularity than it appears to have received, and doubtless suffers more from the obscurity of its author than from the leanness of its matter.

In a preliminary chapter the nature of thought is discussed and defined. All thinking is a relation of cause and effect. If that is true, then any attempt to think the cause without the effect or the effect without the cause will result in a mere half-thought, a vague, elusive fragment of an idea. From this fact "we may derive a fundamental law of human development which is not a mere hypothesis or conjecture, but a plain deduction from the very nature of thought." The various types of civilization in the orient and the occident are the result of a one-sided interest in cause or effect. "The one tendency emphasizes causality or dependence, the other lays an equally one-sided emphasis upon effects, is engrossed with visible, practical results. Thus each tends to ignore what the other exaggerates." The dominant tendency works itself out in every phase of life—in religion, morality, science, art and social organization.

Thus the difference between the civilizations of India and classical antiquity is accounted for by the tendency of the former to emphasize causality or dependence; and of the latter, to be intent on effects or mere results. Accordingly we meet with the passive and contemplative mind in the East and with the active

and practical mind in the West. The one is retrospective, reverent toward the past, and submissive to authority; the other is prospective, eager for novelty and progress.

Guided by this principle the author analyzes and interprets, in four books, *The Civilization of India*, *Classical Civilization*, *The Middle Ages*, *Modern Civilization*. In each book he discusses in order the religion, morality, science, art, and social institutions of the several countries and ages. The reader is naturally afraid of a man who has found a key, especially one that will explain all the mysteries of civilization. Yet it must be conceded that the writer pleads his cause with remarkable ingenuity and with his striking antitheses and epigrammatic sentences throws new light on his subject at many points. If he does nothing else, he sets one thinking along the broad and deep lines which are coextensive with the breadth and depth of the racial movement itself.

Space will not allow us to quote extensively. Let a single paragraph suffice to illustrate the style of the author. Speaking of Calvinism he says: "We are at once confronted by its most enigmatic characteristic—its strange blending of fatalism with great zeal for liberty. The Calvinists struggled against external tyranny and gloried in inner slavery. Medievalism on the contrary bowed humbly before outer despotism but clung to its faith in the freedom of the soul." The book abounds in keen distinctions like these. They may raise problems rather than solve them; but a production that does even that is well worth the reading.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS.

THE MODERN READER'S BIBLE. *The Books of the Bible with Three Books of the Apocrypha presented in Modern Literary Form, edited, with Introductions and Notes, by Richard G. Moulton, M.A. (Camb.), Ph.D. (Penn.), Professor of Literary Theory and Interpretation in the University of Chicago.* New York, The Macmillan Co. Pages xiv + 1733. Price \$2.00 net.

This book contains the twenty-one volumes of *The Modern Reader's Bible* which have been issued from time to time during the last twelve years. It is the same text, the same introductions and notes, with some enlargements, which appeared in the single volumes of the series. The work as we now have it is a masterpiece of the book-maker's art. The type is clear and read with ease, the pages are thin but strong and opaque, and the book is not too cumbersome to be easily handled. The combination of all the books into one volume is not only a matter of convenience; it is of great advantage in clearly representing to the eye as well as the mind the unity of the Scriptures.

In the preface the author defines his purpose. His funda-

mental thesis is that the Bible is literature and contains the literary forms which are found in the literatures of the world generally—lyrics, epics, dramas, essays, sonnets, treatises. In the ordinary versions the variety of literary forms is lost in a “monotonous uniformity of numbered sentences, more suggestive of an itemized legal instrument than of what we understand as literature. The reason for this is found in the method of preparing ancient manuscripts and the reconstruction of the biblical texts, by medieval commentators, into verses and chapters without regard to the sense.” The aim of Prof. Moulton is to discover, “from internal evidence of the writings themselves, and by principles of comparative literature, the exact literary form and detailed structure of the books of Scripture; and then to use all devices of modern printing for the purpose of indicating such structure to the eye of the reader. Introductions to the books, and notes, have been added, but these are secondary; the page setting, if only it is correct, is itself the best of commentaries.”

In these words the author describes also the limitations of his work. He does not profess to speak as a theologian and to enter into doctrinal discussions. Nor does he pretend to decide questions which belong to the sphere of biblical or higher criticism. He accepts the conclusions of specialists in this department as a basis for the literary rearrangement of the text and the books of the Bible. He does not play the part of a historian of the Hebrew and Israelite people, but he seeks rather to make clear “the interpretation of the history of Israel made once for all by the sacred writers, and embodied in the finished literature we call the Bible.”

The order of the books in the Old and New Testaments differs from that of the ordinary versions. The scheme of grouping the several books appears in the following table of contents: (1) Bible History: The Old Testament; (2) the Books of the Prophets (the biblical books from Isaiah to Malachi arranged in their proper literary forms, serving as supplements to the later periods of Old Testament history); (3) Bible Poetry (the Book of Psalms, the Book of Lamentations, the Song of Songs); (4) Bible Philosophy: The Books of Wisdom (the Wisdom Books of the Old Testament and Apocrypha in the order of their philosophical sequence); (5) Bible History: The New Testament (Books of the New Testament arranged as constituting the History of the Primitive Church as presented by itself: the Gospel of St. Luke—continued in the Acts of the Apostles—in which are inserted in their proper places the Epistles of St. Paul—to which are subjoined the other Epistles of the New Testament); (6) New Testament Literature (the remaining books of the New Testament: the Gospel of St. Matthew, the Gospel of St. Mark, the

Gospel of St. John, the Revelation of St. John). The literary introductions to each of the books, the general notes and notes to particular books are found in the last three hundred and seventy-four pages and enhance the value of the work. In concise form the author here presents the results of a lifetime of exhaustive literary study.

We do not pretend to criticise in detail the arrangement of the books or the construction of the text. Prof. Moulton would be the last one to claim finality in these respects. But the aim of the book and the legitimacy of the method no one can well gainsay. The Bible appears like a new book. What once appeared as vague, unhistoric, and colorless, now stands out as real, human, and historical. The recognition of the variety of forms means a new insight into the wealth and the beauty of the contents. It is our conviction that this work will stimulate a love for Bible reading in the average layman. What was to him at one time lifeless uniformity will now sparkle with an endless variety of a living organism throbbing with human aspirations and passions and aglow with divine revelation and power.

We trust the preacher will not fail to procure this volume and re-read his Bible in this form. It ought to be in the teacher's study and on the family table. Before one studies the commentary and Bible dictionary, for light on different passages, the Modern Reader's Bible ought to be carefully studied. It is an indispensable aid to all classes of Bible readers.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS.

THE AGE OF SCHISM. Being an Outline of the History of the Church from A. D. 1304 to A. D. 1503. By Herbert Bruce, M.A., Lecturer and Head of the Department of History in the University College, Cardiff, formerly Scholar of St. John's College, Oxford. New York, The Macmillan Co. Pages viii + 278. Price \$1.00 net.

One of the most interesting periods of church history is the transition from the thirteenth to the sixteenth century. It is the time when the tendencies which have been striving for the mastery for 500 years become dominant and culminate in the renaissance and the reformation. A clear understanding of these great epochs in the life of the western world requires a knowledge of the men and movements in politics, literature, art, and religion in the immediately preceding centuries. There were reformers before the reformation to whom the leaders of protestantism owed no small debt. Yet in the general histories of the church only a brief space is devoted to this period. The teacher in the theological seminary probably passes over it with a lecture or two in the classroom. This treatise is sufficiently extensive and condensed for the use of the general reader, and a concise summary for the special student. It is what it claims to be—an outline. Yet in the

eleven chapters, into which the contents are divided, all the salient tendencies are presented in a vivid and comprehensive way.

The reader is impressed by the balance and moderation of the author who strives to present both the lights and shadows of this uncertain and restless time. Historians have been inclined to paint in blackest colors the corruptions in head and members of church and state. "But I have tried," says Mr. Bruce, "to show from the evidence of the literature of the time, as well as from some of the records which exist of the inner religious life of individuals and of the Church as a whole, that, despite the manifest evils of outward organization and frequently of character (among both clerks and laymen), it was in many ways a period of intense and vividly self-conscious religious experience." One finds an unusually fair presentation of the virtues and vices of the Avigonesse popes. They were justly charged by their satirizing contemporaries with avarice, nepotism, intrigue, partiality and despotism. But it must not be forgotten that they made serious efforts to reform the clergy, to extend the borders of the church by missionary activity in north Africa and farther Asia, and to improve universities and foster the liberal arts. They were, indeed, far from the apostolic ideal and failed to comprehend the spiritual character of Christ's kingdom, yet they must be judged in the light of their age and of their heritage coming down from the fathers.

Of special value is the fourth chapter on the Church Life in the Fourteenth Century. The conflicting tendencies are traced and the virtues and vices of the ecclesiastical officials are presented. There are evidently disintegrating forces at work in the popes and cardinals, in archbishops and bishops, in monks and friars. In the better spirits of the age the need of reform is keenly felt. The new national literatures are filled with criticisms of the church and the awakened conscience of the teutonic people becomes dissatisfied with the formalism and inane dogmatism of the schoolmen. The reaction toward a simpler, more experimental, and a personal religion manifests itself in the heretics, the mystics, and the great preachers of the century. But these protests are either ignored or suppressed. The evil day is put off until the appearance of the irrepressible Saxon and Swiss reformers.

In the second part of the book the papal schism, the reforming councils, and the popes of the latter half of the fifteenth century are discussed in their relation to the literary and religious era which follows.

Both for style and substance the book is commendable and will repay careful perusal.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS.

THE CHURCH AND THE CHANGING ORDER. By Shailer Matthews, Professor of Historical and Comparative Theology in the University of Chicago. Pages 225. New York, published by The Macmillan Co. Price \$1.50.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE SOCIAL ORDER. By R. J. Campbell, M.A., Minister of the City Temple, London. Pages 284. New York, published by The Macmillan Co. Price \$1.50.

JESUS CHRIST AND THE CIVILIZATION OF TO-DAY. By Joseph A. Leighton, Ph.D., Professor of Philosophy and Psychology in Hobart College. Pages 242. New York, published by The Macmillan Co. Price \$1.50.

These three works occupy the same general field. The aim of each is to examine the existing social order in the light of the teachings of Jesus and determine the attitude of the Christian Church of to-day, as the recognized depository of these teachings, toward the social order. That the Christian Church, to-day as never before, is being stirred into a new sense of social responsibility, is fully attested by the frequency with which books of this class have been coming from the press in the past few years.

The starting point of *The Church and the Changing Order* is the fact that remarkable social changes are impending, and that not only will the Church be profoundly affected by these changes, since it is a part of the social order, but that it must choose, not whether it shall play a part or not, but what part it shall play, in bringing about the new social order. This need of defining its attitude toward formative forces now at work in society constitutes for the Christian Church a real crisis. In six chapters the author discusses the attitude of the Church with respect to the most important of these forces, viz., scholarship, the gospel of the risen Christ, the gospel of human brotherhood, social discontent, the social movement and materialism. The concluding chapter deals with the proper training of the Christian ministry.

The heart of the author's argument is to be found in the ominous but undeniable fact that through indifference, and even avowed hostility, to the claims of modern scholarship and the needs of the wage-earning classes, the Church has very largely alienated men of learning, on the one side, and the so-called lower classes, on the other, so that its influence is for the most part confined to the middle stratum of society.

The hostile attitude of the Church towards scholarship is best seen in its treatment of the teachings of modern science and of the claims for the scientific study of the Bible. The author declares that the philosophies and interpretative concepts of the Church have been derived from a pre-scientific age, and that, though scholarship is now shaping the thinking of all classes, the Church is still content to breathe the intellectual atmosphere of the medieval world and still persists in antagonizing every attempt to translate the principles of the New Testament into

modern thought forms. And the inevitable result is the alienation of a most influential class.

With the claims of the wage-earning classes the Church has likewise manifested little interest or sympathy. And this, too, despite the fact that the Church is peculiarly fitted to play an important part in the social order. For religion appeals to powers and instincts that are elemental and common to all men, and is, therefore, better fitted to promote social unity than are those influences which are accidental, and, consequently, divisive and disintegrating. And Christianity is fitted beyond other religions for this function of socialization, for through its teaching of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man it engenders among its adherents, as other religions do not and can not, fraternal instincts. The most cursory examination of Christianity will show that it is not for isolated life. It implies social relations and its virtues are those, not of the hermit and anchorite, but of the man who lives among his fellows.

That the Church has failed to realize its social possibilities is beyond question. The specific reasons why it has failed to win and hold the laboring classes are twofold: first, the Church generally, and the Protestant portion of it in particular, is composed very largely of persons in sympathy with the capitalistic classes; and, secondly, professing Christians have too often failed to apply the principles which they profess to industrial matters. For these two reasons the laboring classes have come to regard the Church as something in alliance with capitalism. And on its part, it must be admitted, the Church has made little serious or systematic effort to get the view-point of the discontented elements of society. The duty then of the Church is clear, if difficult. It must first see that this discontent is not rooted in economic considerations alone but that it proceeds also from a passionate longing to realize in society the fundamental ideals of fraternity and justice. And then, secondly, the Church must apply the spirit of Jesus to these ideals through the slow process of developing new moral and religious ideals in the discontented classes.

Christianity and the Social Order is the work of the celebrated London preacher whose theological views have aroused such a ferment throughout the Protestant church. The reader who is looking for something positive and concrete, clearly stated and boldly asserted, will not be disappointed; for almost on the first page the startling proposition is laid down that Socialism and Christianity—that is, Christianity emancipated from traditionalism and ecclesiasticism—are essentially one.

The author frankly admits with Professor Matthews that the Christian Church is fast losing its hold on certain classes of

society, but he views the matter with a far greater degree of equanimity. To his mind the decline of the Christian Church does not necessarily spell the decline of Christianity, for other influences may arise to take its place. Indeed such an influence has already arisen in modern Socialism which is declared to be far nearer to the teachings of Jesus, and the Christianity of his early followers, than is the Christianity of the so-called orthodox churches of the present day.

In order to establish his thesis that Socialism and Christianity are essentially one, the author has made a careful study of the various conceptions of the Kingdom of God as they are found in Jewish history, in primitive Christianity and in modern Christianity. From this examination he concludes that the Kingdom of God, as that term is used in the Old Testament, in the primitive Church, and by Jesus himself, means an ideal social order on earth; for which, however, modern Christianity has substituted the principle of an individual salvation which is to take place in some other world and some other life than this. In adopting this other-world viewpoint modern Christianity has departed so far from the beliefs of the first followers of Jesus that it is only by a stretch of the imagination that it can be called Christianity at all.

The Socialism, however, which the author seems to have in mind and which is to take the place of this pseudo-Christianity is a very ideal sort of Socialism. It is, of course, something more than the communal ownership of the means of production. It is defined as "all for each and each for all"; as a denial of the ape and tiger qualities and an appeal to the higher motives of justice, compassion and public spirit. In fact, Socialism, according to the author, is simply a revival of primitive and true Christianity in the form best suited to the modern mind. With this definition the identification of Socialism with Christianity assumes at once a less startling aspect, although the implication that Christianity is nothing more than a system of morality remains.

In the concluding chapters are sketched the main features of the socialized state as it will be when the tendencies now at work will have worked themselves out.

In Jesus Christ and the Civilization of To-day we have a point of view that differs materially from that of Christianity and the Social Order. Its aim is to discover the fundamental ethical needs of contemporary life and determine the bearings of Jesus' ethical teaching on this spiritual life of to-day. Not only is it more metaphysical in style and argument, and couched in more general terms, than Christianity and the Social Order, but it makes social organization simply a means to the realization of

a higher personal life in individuals, whereas the latter, if it does not regard the establishment of an ideal social order as an end in itself, at least fails to lay proper emphasis on the worth of the inner spiritual life. In no other way can personality grow and develop than through communion with others; and social institutions and traditions have ethical significance only as they minister to the inner spiritual life and make possible a new spiritual manhood. Jesus teaches the supreme worth of the individual and in this lies his chief contribution to modern civilization. To the recognition of this principle is due the individual's growth in freedom and opportunity to develop his own life and make the best of his own possibilities in action and feeling, so characteristic of modern civilization; and by this principle, too, must every scheme for social betterment be tried.

A. V. HESTER.

UND DANN? Zehn biblische Vorträge über die persönlich Vollendung.
Paul Blau, Konsistorialrath und Hofprediger in Wernigerode. Berlin,
Trowitzsch & Sohn, 1907.

This brochure of 125 pages is as edifying in its contents as it is brilliant in style and positive in argument. The topics discussed contain an inquiry into the reality of the hereafter, the mystery of death, the secret of life, between two worlds, the development of the soul in the hereafter, the resurrection of the dead, before the judgment seat of Christ, condemnation or restitution, the blessedness of the saved, eternity, men, and an answer to the question: has Christ really risen? The author maintains that Christ himself is the best assurance for the reality of the spiritual world, because in Him this world has become reality and it is but the reasonable completion of his spiritual life on earth that his course should not end in the grave but in the resurrection, and what is true of Him is true for everyone who believes in Him, but those who have not begun their eternal life on earth will never begin it. He holds that man was in distinction from all the animals originally created sinless and immortal, but sin brought bodily death to the first man and through him to all men, the just and the unjust. Christ has died for our sins and all who believe in Him will also triumph with Him over sin and death. The assurance that we have a living God above us and a divine life within us in Christ, entitles us to speak of our eternal life beyond the grave. On the basis of the story of Dives and Lazarus the author goes on to say that we must accept the existence of an intermediate state in which the souls of the departed remain until the second coming of Christ. In this state the souls are not sleeping but fully awake and conscious, and yet entirely separated from this life, which they cannot influence in any way, as falsely taught by modern spiritualism. But the

souls of the so-called dead are not only separated from the living, but also from one another in this sense that the believers enter at once into paradise and the unbelievers the place of torment or hades, while the final judgment only takes place at the second coming of Christ. During the intermediate state, however, there reigns perfect bliss in paradise, while the gospel is continually preached to those who are in the place of torment or hades, since there are many who never had an opportunity to hear the gospel while still in the flesh. The resurrection from the dead which is the final act in the great drama of life, is a specifically Christian doctrine, it is more than mere acquisition of immortality. It involves on the one hand the rise of a new body, which must be compared with the new plant which grows out of the seed; flesh and blood are transformed and glorified. Something of this glorification begins already in this life, as demonstrated by the spiritualized countenances which we meet every now and then on earth. On the other hand this new body is a body only subject to the laws of spirit and not of matter. The last scene in this act is the judgment, foretold by Jesus, when each man's character shall be revealed as manifested in his faith and conduct, for, to the Christian the two belong together, no faith without morality, no morality without faith. Separation will then become permanent, the end of eternal torment will be final annihilation or death of the soul, so that God will be all in all and the redemption work of Christ will be completed in eternal blessedness. Every saved personality will be developed according to its own inherent characteristics and perfect harmony will reign in the glorious communion with the Lord Christ.

Such are in brief outline the contents of Blair's book. Although we do not agree with all the views of the author, especially not with the distinctions he makes between human and animal death and the origin and nature of sin, we were profoundly impressed and edified, and recommend the book to all who love a quiet hour of meditation and edification.

R. C. SCHIEDT.

THE MEANING AND MESSAGE OF THE CROSS. A contribution to Missionary Apologetics. By Henry C. Mabie, D.D., Corresponding Secretary American Baptist Missionary Union.

This is an interesting and suggestive volume in which the author discusses one of the most profound and important subjects in theology, having special reference to the cross as it involves the great atonement Christ made for the redemption of the race. There are twelve chapters in the book. In the first he carefully distinguishes between the cross of reconciliation and the tragedy of the crucifixion,—the cross of our glorying and the crucifixion crime. He sees in the death of Jesus something far deeper than

a contemplation of the cross, and a remembrance of the agony of His death. That appeals to the senses, as is done by the Passion Play, the crucifix in the Roman Churches, and pictures of calvary. The author says, "to one who apprehends the real character of the Atonement these representations are gross and revolting." Such appeals, however, do not give the conception of the message of the cross; that lies back of such representations. The death on the cross was the climax of the life of the Saviour.

In the seventh chapter the author discusses "The life of self-crucifixion with Christ, or, the spiritual life as the habit of our new being." This conception embraces two ideas: (1) A whole-hearted reliance by faith on the age-long achievement of reconciliation wrought out by God Himself through Christ's cross, objectively considered; (2) a renewed life in the inward man, the fruit of God's spirit, subjectively developed. The spiritual life at every step must be self crucifixion, "the habit of a new life." The Saviour unflinchingly encountered everything which lay between Him and the goal, suffering all that was necessary to deal with the problem of sin. He who sees this as a work of grace wrought for him, will hate sin and will voluntarily crucify himself, which is essential to God-likeness. He says, "it is not the new character, in that naturalistic superficial sense in which the term is often used when it is said, 'the soul is saved by character.'" Works of faith are therefore a different thing from salvation by works of law or by natural character. We are to live in the truth as Christ did, not merely patronizing it "but grasping it by personally surrendering to its authority and held captive by it."

In the further discussion he refers to two tendencies, advocated and supported by exponents of evangelic faith who emphasize natural ethics, and ignore the cross of Christ. And here he joins issue with Professor Albrecht Ritschl, whose system is modified and enlarged by Hermann, Kaftan, and Schultz in Germany, and by Professor McGiffert, of Union Seminary, Professor Clarke, of Colgate University, and others. He calls the system "a strange compound of speculative agnosticism and religious pietism, so unlike the Christianity of the New Testament as to be scarcely recognizable." "It roots itself in the speculative idealism of Immanuel Kant, whose motive is to eliminate the supernatural element in Christianity and even to deny the reality of the objective world." A strong arraignment, indeed, of the philosophy of Kant. Dr. McCosh says: "It is one of the most fatal dogmas ever introduced into philosophy and lies at the basis of all the aberrations of the school of speculation which followed." Professor Seth says: "Kant is the *fons et origo* of the most cultivated agnosticism of the day." "The Ritschlian system is in

its first principles a most radical departure from what has ever been received as historic Christianity."

After a preliminary discussion, exposing fallacies of the Ritchlian system, he notes five negative and characteristic postulates of the scheme as important, if the real issue between Ritchlianism and the more biblical, evangelical system is to be understood. (1) Ritchlians deny the essential nature of God as an absolute and truly sovereign Being. (2) They entertain the most revolutionary views respecting the divine government. (3) From this they easily pass to an entirely revolutionary view of sin and its proper judgment. (4) They have departed just as far from reality in its conception of the love of God. (5) They go further than this, and deny the Person of Christ, His proper divine human character which has always been deemed essential to any competency in the Redeemer for effecting an adequate reconciliation as between God and sinful man. "These postulates are carefully analyzed, sifted, and stripped of what is irrelevant." On page 159 he states his position thus: "In yielding to the authority of an objective truth of divine revelation, one yields to Christ: he dies to self-will which has hitherto stood outside the truth: and so in dying the Divine Spirit quickens or makes active by resurrection power the soul thus surrendered; whereas, in the Ritchlian view there is simply a naturalistic act of will standing on its own energy, without any Divine Spirit to make the dead to live again." The author is convinced that the Ritchlian system possesses misleading elements.

In the closing chapter he shows the bearing this exposition of the message of the cross has on the missionary activity of the church. No one can fail to see the value of a true message in the effort to Christianize the heathen world. The motive for missions is found in its message of the Saviour who suffered and died. No sacrifice can be too great to carry this message to the ends of the earth.

This book is valuable, as may be inferred from what has been briefly sketched, and is worthy of a place in any well selected library. It is not simply to be read but studied, and for that we earnestly commend it.

JOSEPH W. SANTEE.

THE CHRIST THAT IS TO BE. By the author of "Pro Christo et Ecclesia." Pages 385. New York, The Macmillan Company. Price \$1.50 net.

This very readable volume is a distinctive addition to the modern group of books which attempt a re-statement of the Gospel of Jesus. Its animating spirit is the buoyant faith that the principles of conduct laid down by Jesus, the character he exemplified, and the faith he revealed, if closely wrought into the lives of his followers, would quickly and effectually enfranchise the race from spiritual and physical bondage. The anonymous

author modestly call his book "only a series of successive efforts to think what the Gospel of Jesus really is." Nevertheless, the careful reader soon gains the conviction that these "unfinished fragments" of thoughts are admirably arranged, logically cemented and consistently unified by one central conception. This central idea the author finds in Christ's purpose, by his works and words, to found on earth the Kingdom of God. But this volume is differentiated from many others of similar tendency by the fact that the pith and marrow of its contention is that in the realized Kingdom of God salvation will be physical as well as spiritual. The physical powers displayed by Christ, his miracles of healing, etc., are regarded as characteristic features of that kingdom. In the practice of Jesus two sorts of heavenly powers were associated as a double revelation of God's will for man. He brought moral and physical power to men that were sinful and sick. Hence the imitation of Jesus includes the healing of the sick, the casting out of devils and the feeding of the poor with enough and to spare. This imitation of Christ is obligatory. The church must so possess God in Christ that she will be able to communicate His health, physical and moral, to the sick and the sinful, until they shall be compelled by experience to rise up and call her blessed. Read superficially the book might be mistaken for a disguised plea for Christian Science, or Faith Cure. But upon closer investigation one will find in its pages a closely reasoned, scriptural and scientific corrective of the vagaries of these cults, side by side with a forcible presentation of the element of truth which gives them their modern vogue. Besides the main argument which runs through four books this volume opens luminous vistas of thought into many regions contiguous upon its argument. It contains a suggestive treatment of demoniacal possessions. It also contains, provisionally, a scientific rehabilitation of the devil and his angels.

On the whole, it is a thought-compelling book, a distinctive addition to the current kingdom literature.

THEO. F. HERMAN.

NEW THEOLOGY SERMONS. By T. J. Campbell, M.A., Minister of the City Temple, London. New York, The Macmillan Company. Pp. 294. Price \$1.25 net.

This volume contains twenty sermons, most of them preached in the City Temple during the last year. The topics discussed are the following: The Gain of Life, Phil. 1: 21; The Risen Christ, Mat. 28: 6; The Resurrection Power, Rom. 1: 4; The Ever-Present Christ, Mat. 28: 20; The Sinlessness of Jesus, John 8: 46; The Gift of the Son, John 3: 16; Sin and Salvation, Luke 1: 76-7; From Death to Life, Rom. 6: 23; The Atoning Will, Heb. 10: 7; A Love that Died, John 18: 18; The Son of Perdi-

tion, John 17: 12; The Mistake of Sin, Rom. 6: 21; Love Destroying and Restoring, Ps. 90: 3; The Turning from Iniquity, Acts 3: 26; The Cleansing Life, 1 John 1: 7; Our Moral Limitations, Zech. 3: 4; The Angel of the Soul, Mat. 17: 10; The Valley of Baca, Ps. 84: 6; The Sweetening of the Waters of Marah, Exod. 15: 23-25; Believing Prayer, Mat. 21: 22.

A sermon is, or ought to be, divine truth filtering through a human personality. It needs to be considered, therefore, not only in the light of its substance or matter, but also in the light of the personality of the preacher. It is the latter especially that gives weight to the discourses of the Rev. T. J. Campbell, and explains why such large congregations go to hear him. He has a winning countenance, a pleasing presence, and an earnest manner. Hearing him when he is at his best, one cannot fail to be impressed with the thought that here is a pure, spiritually-minded man, convinced that he has a message to deliver for the uplifting of his hearers, who, without resort to sensational methods or tricks of oratory, endeavors to bring home to them the truths which burn in his own soul for their instruction and edification. This impression is produced also by some of the sermons in this volume, although none of them carries with them the force of personality which they had as they fell from the lips of the speaker.

Unfortunately Mr. Campbell is not as great a theologian as he is a preacher, and when he stands forth as the exponent of the "New Theology," although he makes many strong points in his sermons, he preaches an emasculated gospel on the one hand by failing to apprehend the full significance of the "word made flesh," while, on the other, he overshoots the mark by charging what he calls "conventional" Christianity with doctrines and beliefs which cannot properly be laid at the door of intelligent Christians either protestant or Roman Catholic. On the whole it would not be unfair to say of these sermons: "What is true is not new, and what is new is not true." Of course this does not mean that men's views do not change, and have not changed in matters of Christian doctrine as in matters of natural science. If there were no progress of growth there would be no need of a History of Dogmas in Christian Theology. But when it comes to the setting aside of the whole course of development from the time of Paul and the other apostles down to the close of the nineteenth century, and the substitution of a "New Theology" which preaches a Christianity without Christ in the real sense of the word, an atonement without redemption, and a final salvation for all mankind, one may well inquire whether such a movement indicates progress or decadence. It reminds one of the man who carried his candle out of a dark cellar into the bright sunlight, and then exclaimed: "Behold how my candle has illuminated the world!"

It is, of course, impossible in a review like this to take up the

sermons in detail for examination and criticism. It may suffice to indicate the general trend of thought by referring briefly to the three leading topics of the author's "New Theology," viz.: his Christology, his Soteriology, and his Eschatology. His Christology is contained especially in the first six sermons. He accepts the Jesus of New Testament history and calls Him the Christ. But the Christhood of Jesus is preeminent and unique only in degree, not in kind; and how it came to be preeminent in degree is precisely what he does not even attempt to explain. Both St. Paul and the writer of the fourth gospel (not St. John the apostle) got the idea of a Divine Man from the blending of Jewish and Grecian thought at Alexandria, to the coming of whom the world was looking forward. "The idea in the mind of these old thinkers from whom St. Paul learned this truth was that the being of God, though infinitely complex, and having a myriad aspects of which we can know nothing, is in one of those aspects the source of humanity as distinct from all else. Whatever else he may be, God is eternally man. He is all that we mean by ideal manhood, and infinitely more. There is therefore eternally in the heart of God a fontal or archetypal man to whom we all belong and whose life is the light of men (pp. 5-6). "To St. Paul Jesus was the Divine Man himself, the Divine Man self-limited, but none the less the very source and soul of the ideal" (p. 8). But according to the author this has come to pass in a purely natural way. The same kind of ideal manhood that is in God slumbers in every human being, and it needs but to be quickened or "raised" to become real and efficient. "The only way in which it [the kingdom of heaven] can come is by making every man a Christ" (p. 25). "By the word Christ, as you know, I mean not only Jesus, but the spirit of Jesus, the true or ideal humanity in every human soul (p. 24). It will be seen at once that this is a very different conception from that of the incarnate Son of God. In the same way the author follows the historical life of Jesus, making a distinction between the actual facts of his life, and the interpretation of these facts by the disciples and the early church. Jesus rose from the dead, for the disciples saw him and conversed with him; but his body, "the dust of Jesus, still lies in some underground, rockhewn cavern outside of Jerusalem." At the same time the disciples firmly believed in his physical resurrection, "because they had no conception of an existence apart from the body." The fourth gospel is not intended to be historical. It is written for a purpose, and much is put in the mouth of Jesus that is not strictly his, but embodies the testimony of the early Christian consciousness to His life and teaching.

The author's Soteriology is, of course, based on his Christology. The divine ideal of humanity, as found in God, is present in every man, and man naturally longs for and strives after God. Even

sin is only a "blundering search for God." It would be unfair to charge the author with a failure to recognize sin as evil. He is very explicit on this subject and insists that every transgression entails punishment, because it is a violation of law. But even so, the real character of sin from the psychological point of view is misapprehended, because the author confounds the dissatisfaction and restlessness of the human soul until it has found God with a seeking for and striving after God. Sin is selfishness and a deliberate choice of transgression and it will not do to call it a blundering search for God any more than it will do to call the experience of a bad, disobedient son that has run away from home and plunges into excesses and crimes a search for his father's house. Undoubtedly the doctrine of total depravity has been carried too far. There is something good in all men, or else they could not be saved. But sound psychology and daily experience alike teach a native selfishness and a hereditary tendency in human development that have the start of and the advantage over the good impulses of which our nature is capable. To be saved, therefore, needs more than the inspiration of a good example, or the awakening of our ideal manhood. It needs the power and grace of a redeemed life in the person of our Lord Jesus Christ mediated by His spirit, and here the author fails to establish a real point of contact. Jesus, indeed, suffered, and he suffered for others; "and wherever and whenever an individual life makes itself a free gift to the common life, some measure of suffering must follow." Here the author is on the threshold of a great and precious truth. He recognizes the necessity of self-sacrificing love in the heart; but he does not see that the self-sacrificing love of Christ becomes, in a real, vital way, the source of healing and salvation in every human soul that comes to Him.

The author brings against "conventional" Christianity the charge that it looks too exclusively for the salvation of men in a future life, and that only for a comparatively small number, while it overlooks or undervalues the necessity of establishing the kingdom of heaven in this world, and, of making men holy and righteous, kindly and loving in their dealings with men here and now. He holds that the love of God is now establishing the reign of peace and joy, and that the conquest of love must go on through the ages until every soul comes home to God and finds peace in the Father's house. It is true that the early Christians looked for the speedy coming of Christ. And it is also true that the significance of Christianity for the present life has sometimes been overlooked. But, surely, it is unfair to charge upon Christianity in general even the slightest degree of indifference to the moral and social condition of mankind. First as to the author's contention that in the end all men will be saved, it may be said that this view overlooks the fact of man's free agency and the permanence

of impressions resulting from self-determination in the formation of character. And as for the other point, while the spirit of Christianity has not yet leavened the whole lump of secular interests, and a great deal needs to be done by applying the principles and the spirit of Christianity to the everyday affairs of human life and the social interests of men, history proves that the very Christianity which the author arraigns and which he would free from "mischievous dogmatic accretions," has produced the saintliest men and women, has furnished the noblest examples of self-sacrificing devotion to human well-being, and has proved itself the inspiring motive in every movement that has made for larger freedom, purer morality, and higher ideals in the lives of individuals and of nations. "By their fruits shall ye know them."

JOHN S. STAHR.

CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY. By Milton Valentine, D.D., LL.D., late Professor of Systematic Theology in the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa. Two volumes, octavo. Pages 476 + 454. Philadelphia, Lutheran Publication Society. Price, \$5.00.

The venerable author was just about to complete the manuscript of this work when on the seventh of February, 1906, he was taken from the scene of his long labors as a theologian and an educator. He was, by a beautiful coincidence, discussing the resurrection when he laid down his pen for the last time. His son and editor has wisely published the manuscript without any attempt to carry out the suggestions found in marginal notes, which indicated that the author was still unsatisfied with the form of his treatise.

The book belongs to the familiar species of posthumous works on systematic theology. It is, however, one of the very best of its kind. Dr. Valentine, even at the age of eighty-one was distinguished by a very unusual degree of vigor and freshness of thought.

The introduction is ruled by the old distinction between natural and revealed religion. Speaking of ethnic religions the author says (p. 18): "Even the greatest and best of them, however ancient or prevalent, clearly appear as simply natural products of human thought seeking to interpret the world and human life." This dualistic view of the religious life of mankind is unscriptural, and it is a hindrance rather than a help to the theologian in the defense of the idea of a distinctive and final Christian revelation. The counterpart appears in these words (p. 28): "A religion which transcends the data of simply natural theology can have no authority for its higher teachings until it secures reason's favorable verdict upon its divine credentials." This is obsolete British apologetics and absolutely

un-Lutheran. A more modern principle seems to have influenced the statement (p. 114): "It has become abundantly evident that it is impossible to repudiate the miracles . . . and still hold to the generic supernaturalism and redemptory character of Christianity." The whole introduction needs to be reconstructed in accordance with the point of view thus indicated. Otherwise this, which is really the strongest argument for particular miracles, involves an obvious *petitio principii*.

The introduction closes abruptly. We learn from the preface that the author had reserved for his final task the completion of the introduction with a discussion of the Authority of the Scriptures. It may readily be inferred from the tenor of the book as a whole that he would have advocated the old theory of inspiration.

It is true of works on dogmatics generally that they are seldom true to the principles consciously elaborated in the prolegomena. Some dogmatists write irreproachable introductions and fail to live up to them. Others are largely led by principles of which they are not clearly conscious. The latter seems to be the case here.

It is curious to observe that at the very outstart, in discussing the Idea of God, the author practically abandons the concept of revelation that dominates the introduction. The idea is a "psychic product." "The internal idea of God, however and whenever reached, is a presupposition for the recognition of supernatural phenomena as of God" (p. 158). Dr. Valentine's defense of primitive monotheism is excellent. Under the attributes he gives very large space to omniscience, being concerned to maintain the Lutheran theory of the divine foreknowledge. He manifests characteristic acuteness in his presentation of the doctrine of the Trinity.

Under the head of the doctrine of man there is a keen and useful critique of the evolutionary hypothesis.

Students will find the book especially valuable for its luminous and satisfactory expositions of such traditional forms of thought as mediate imputation, *communicatio idiomatum*, *ordo salutis*, etc.

In regard to the doctrine of the Lord's Supper nothing is left of the specifically Lutheran contention except the emphasis upon the point that Christ "can be present with believers everywhere in the completeness of his theanthropic Person."

Throughout, the work is marked by familiarity with the literature of the subject and by originality of treatment. In the style there are a few infelicities and solecisms; but these scarcely impair the good impression produced by the whole.

The work of the editor and the publisher has been well done. The table of contents and the index are very complete and useful.

CHRISTOPHER NOSS.

LEXICON TO THE POETICAL WORKS OF JOHN MILTON. By Laura E. Lockwood, Ph.D. (Yale). New York, The Macmillan Company, 1907. Pages 671. Price \$3.00 net.

In this work Miss Lockwood, who is associate professor of the English language in Wellesley College, has rendered an invaluable service to the cause of letters. Milton has been waiting long for a patient, painstaking, intelligent lexicographer, who should do for him what the German Schmidt did for Shakspeare many years ago. In 1894 Bradshaw's Concordance to the Poetical Works of John Milton was issued from the press of Swan Sonnenschein & Co., London; but this, so far as the reviewer knows, is the first attempt to provide a complete lexicon to Milton's poems.

In her preface Miss Lockwood says: "The purpose of the present work is to provide a means by which the student may readily find the significance of any word in the poetry of Milton. The chief aim has been that of definition, and every word in the poetry has been subjected to a careful examination. Almost every significant word in the vocabulary of Milton is filled with literal and figurative meanings that shade into each other and off into other and related senses; and each word is modified and varied in the shifting lights thrown on it by the context. This is perhaps truer of Milton than of any other English poet. The precise definition of words is, I am sure, impossible, because of their chameleonlike quality and their lack of exact correspondence to the ideas they represent. Yet I hold it wise at least to attempt, in so far as possible, to reinterpret in the medium of everyday English the lines of the poet who speaks in an even less transparent language."

This task the compiler seems to have performed thoroughly and well. The book was begun in 1895, and the first one hundred and seventy pages were in 1898 presented to the philosophical faculty of Yale University as a doctoral thesis. In 1902, at the suggestion of Prof. Albert S. Cook, of the Yale faculty, work was resumed on the book, and in June, 1907, was brought to completion.

In the arrangement and classification of meanings Miss Lockwood has chiefly followed the New English Dictionary, now being issued in parts from the University of Oxford press. "Every occurrence of each word is recorded, except in the case of certain words that appear very frequently; these are given in all their meanings, but are starred to show that not every instance under each category is noted." Recognizing the fact that a grammar of Milton is also needed, the compiler has included some grammatical observations looking toward such a book. She has noted also the accent of words where it differs from the modern prose accent. In an appendix she has added a list of compound words

as they appear in the original text of Milton's own edition. This list is taken from Beeching's reprint of Milton's Poetical Works.

For such work as Miss Lockwood has done every student of Milton, every lover of noble English poetry, must be profoundly grateful. Her volume is entitled to stand on the shelves of our reference libraries by the side of Schmidt's *Shakespeare Lexicon*, Bartlett's *Shakespeare Concordance*, and Bradshaw's *Concordance to Milton*. Hereafter no serious student of Milton's poetry can afford to deny himself access to Lockwood's *Lexicon*. It will be classed among the requisites of every working library.

C. ERNEST WAGNER.

THE THREAD OF GOLD. By A. C. Benson. Pages 244. Price \$1.50. New York, E. P. Dutton & Company.

For a review of this book, whose every page is brightened by the genius of Mr. Benson, see page 191 of the present number.

JOHN C. BOWMAN.

THE LORD OF GLORY: A Study of the Designations of our Lord in the New Testament with Special Reference to His Deity. By Benjamin B. Warfield, Professor in Princeton Theological Seminary. 150 Nassau St., New York, American Tract Society. 1907. Price \$1.50 net.

For a review of this book see page 193.

WILLIAM C. SCHAEFFER.